IDEOLOGY OF THE FUTURE

Dr. M. RAFI-UD-DIN

IDEOLOGY OF THE FUTURE

A study of the laws of human nature and human activity and the manner in which they determine the course of psycho-social evolution, including a refutation of the theories of Karl Marx, Freud, Adler and McDougall.

BY

DR. MOHAMMAD RAFI-UD-DIN,
M.A., Ph.D.
Director Iqbal Academy
Karachi (Pakistan)

Publishers
Din Muhammadi Press,
McLeod Road, Karachi (Pakistan)

Second Edition
September 1956

Publishers

Din Muhammadi Press,
McLeod Road, Karachi (Pakistan).

Note to the present edition.

A few hundred copies of this book, which formed the author's thesis for his doctorate, were brought out in the first edition. Almost all these copies were destroyed in the riots that came with the partition of British India. Hence, in spite of its second edition, the book is coming before the public at large for the first time. In this edition the Introduction has been re-written and some additions have been made in various chapters.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

I

All eminent psychologists and writers on human nature agree that *man possesses an urge for ideals.* This fact is, in my opinion, the key to a scientific theory of human nature which, as the only possible basis of a real and permanent solution of all social and political problems and, consequently, of a real and permanent unity of the human race, is needed so badly by the world to-day. All that we need in order to formulate such a theory is to work out correctly the full implications of this fact in the light of its relation to human activity.

Unfortunately, while these psychologists and writers agree that man has an urge for ideals they disagree as regards the source, the meaning and the purpose of this urge in the nature of man and, therefore, as regards its relation to his activities. According to Freud, it has its source in the sex urge and its object is to provide man with a substitute activity (in the form of Religion, Politics, Morality, Art and Science) for the thwarted and obstructed activity of the sexual instinct. Adler is of the opinion that it results from the instinct of self-assertion. When an individual is unable to satisfy a particular desire for power he creates the desire for a suitable ideal and strives after it to compensate for his sense of inferiority. McDougall thinks that the ideal impulse is the outcome of a combination of all the instincts (known as the sentiment of self regard) and sub-serves the particular instinct of self-assertion. Karl Marx has advanced the view that ideals are rooted in the economic urge of man and are no more than distorted reflections of his economic

conditions. Thus all these writers, in spite of their differences of opinion, agree on the following points :—

(a) That ideals are not the result of an independent urge of human nature.

(b) That they are derived from and sub-serve one or more of those desires and impulses of man, known as the instincts, which man shares with the animals and the object of which is the maintenance of the life of the individual and the race.

I believe that a critical examination of the theories of these writers in the light of all the facts of human nature, reveals that none of them is correct and that the proper place of the urge for ideals in the nature of man can be stated as follows :—

(*a*) *The urge for ideals is neither derived from nor subserves any of those human impulses, known as the instincts, the object of which is the maintenance of life. On the other hand, it is man's natural and independent urge for Beauty and Perfection which rules and controls all such impulses, in spite of their biological compulsion, for the sake of its own satisfaction.*

(*b*) *It is the real, the ultimate and the sole dynamic power of all human activity whether economic or otherwise.*

The above statement constitutes **the Central Idea** of this book. Naturally, it raises the following questions :—

(1) If ideals determine all the activities of men what is it that determines their ideals.

(2) The purpose or function of our instinctive and animal desires having a biological compulsion is to force us to act for the preservation of our life and race. What is the purpose and function of our urge for ideals in the nature of man?

(3) What is the relation of this urge to the economic conditions of a society.

(4) How can the human urge for ideals be properly satisfied? Are all ideals equally satisfactory? If

not, what are the qualities of the ideal that is most satisfactory to the nature of man?

(5) Does the ideal change in the life of the individual and the society? If so, what is the cause of the change? In what direction does the change take place? How does the change find expression at various stages of the life of the growing human individual and the history of the evolving human society? What is the ultimate destination of these changes in the life of the individual and the society? What is the past history of ideals? What is their future course?

(6) What is the explanation of the varieties of ideals and ideologies of human individuals and groups and their mutual hostilities?

(7) What is the relation of the human urge for ideals to the animal instincts of the human being which have a biological compulsion like sex, food, pugnacity etc.?

(8) What is the relation of this urge to various departments of human activity *e.g.*, Politics, Ethics, Law, Art, Education, Science, Philosophy and Religion?

(9) What is its relation to the ultimate Reality of the Universe and to the purpose of creation and evolution?

(10) How can we explain the following in relation to this urge of man? :—Physics, Biology, Psychology (Individual and Social), Unconscious mind, Reason, Intuition, Prophethood, History, Culture, Civilization, Socio-Cultural changes, Wars, Revolutions etc.

I have endeavoured to provide in this book a connected answer to all these questions.

The theory of this book, therefore, takes the shape of a complete and coherent philosophy of life, a unified explanation of the Universe or a *weltanschauung* which correlates all the facts of existence. Incidentally, it derives

support from the latest discoveries in the spheres of Physics, Biology and Psychology. It reconstructs the philosophies of Politics, Ethics, Economics, History, Law, Education and Art and the Individual and Social Psychologies on a single basis, and, therefore, takes the shape of a single Science of Man.

As a philosophy of History it is more definite than the theories of Denilevsky, Spengler, Toynbee, Schubart, Berdyaev, Northrop, Kroeber, Schwetzer and Sorokin since, unlike these theories it starts from a definite idea of the smallest culture-civilization area, which is the human individual, and then goes on to explain out of it the world culture-civilizations, the causes of their appearance and disappearance as well as the conditions and characteristics of the permanent and ultimate culture-civilization of the future—aspects of social philosophy which these philosophers have not even touched.

It explains the process of evolution going on in the human world, consistently with the Bergsonian theory of creative evolution, as a natural continuation of the process which had once proceeded not only in the animal world since the appearance of the first animal cell, but also in the world of matter, since the earliest shape of the Universe came into existence. It explains how the past and the future process of evolution is the unfolding of a single scheme in the Universe. According to it, the evolution of human societies follows a certain logic depending upon the immutable laws of human nature governing the selection and rejection of ideals. As such it may be called the theory of *Dialectical* or *Historical Idealism* in contrast with the Marxian theory of *Dialectical or Historical Materialism*. But since all its conclusions are derived, ultimately, from the nature of the human self, it may be also called *Selfism* or the *Philosophy of Self*. While the object of the Marxian theory of History is to show that man lives for the sake of living, the theory of history outlined in this book, suggests a definite purpose of human life which being the purpose of the Universe itself, is being achieved gradually in the

process of evolution.

Instead of the class-war theory of Marx, it gives the view, that, ever since man has become conscious of himself, there has proceeded in the human world a war of ideal-groups which will go on as long as humanity has not discovered and accepted the ideal which is most satisfactory to their nature. To the extent to which an ideal does not suit human nature it is unstable and contains the germs of its own dissolution. Sooner or later, it must break up and make room for a more satisfactory ideal. Every unsatisfactory ideal is being disrupted from within by the elements if its own contradiction and is being attacked from outside by other ideals so that ultimately the most satisfactory and the most perfect ideal alone will prevail ousting all the other ideals. All imperfect ideals mark transitory phases in the history of man and are only mistaken substitutes for the most perfect ideal of the future. Since the forces of our nature are driving us towards this ideal every moment of our life, the total result of all progress of Science and Philosophy will be to lend ever greater and greater support to it.

The theory accounts for many of those facts which could not fit into the materialist philosophy of Karl Marx and which, therefore, he had overlooked or attempted to explain away, for example, the pursuit of art for its own sake or the disinterested love of knowledge or the real ecstatic joy of religious or mystic experience, excelling by far any pleasure derived from even the fullest satisfaction of economic needs. By explaining the urge of the unconscious mind as an urge for Beauty and Perfection, the theory of this book reconciles the divergent schools of psycho-analysis. It gives the scientific foundations of all the great religions of the world and hence not only provides them with a rational and intellectual support, which they need so much at present, but also welds them into a single fundamental unity.

II

As a refutation of Marxism, it deserves the particular attention of the "free nations" of the world who are now worried by the growing political power of Communism, as a threat to their own existence. The strenuous efforts of these nations to check the advance of Communism, have not yet succeeded. The cause of their failure is, that, they have not yet completely realized that the real issue between Communism and the rest of world is an intellectual one and can be settled only on the intellectual plane. Communism is a philosophy and can be met only by a philosophy. No amount of economic aids or political alliances, armaments or atom-bombs, prisons or bullets can stand against the force of ideas which conquer the hearts of men. Unless they refute the Marxist philosophy finally and completely, Communism will persist in the world even after it has been defeated in the battle-field and will, in due course of time, recover its political and military power once lost to its enemies.

Now what is the central idea in Marxism, the idea from which Marx has started and on the foundations of which he has built the whole of his philosophy? It is as follows :—

"The ideals of men are determined by their economic conditions."

Marx has himself confessed that this idea has served him as the 'guiding thread of his studies'. Indeed the entire philosophy of Marx is but a logical development of this idea and it is to his credit that he has worked out its philosophical implications so well, that, the moment we accept it, it becomes impossible for us to disagree with any of his subsequent conclusions. It is really this idea that a fresh convert to Communism accepts the moment he enters his new faith. And it is this idea the truth of which is challenged by a man who believes intelligently that Communism is wrong.

"This is absurd!" he says. "It is on the other hand the economic conditions of men that are determined by their ideals".

As a matter of fact the above statement is not only the beginning and the end of any possible refutation of Marxism but also a profound scientific truth. But this statement is not enough by itself. We cannot convert the modern intellectual man to the view that it embodies, by merely stating it. If we assert that ideals are not the result but the cause of economic conditions, we must prove that it is so and our proof will never be complete and will never convince anybody unless we answer all the questions raised by our proposition and show its relation to all the other facts of existence.

This means that we must explain all the known facts of existence and construct a complete philosophy of man and Universe on the basis of our proposition (as Marx has done on the basis of his own central idea) before we can hope that any intellectual person will be converted to our view. Such a philosophy alone can be a complete and convincing refutation—in fact any *real* or *possible* refutation—of Marxism. Unfortunately, although Marx gave his challenge to the intellectual world more than a century ago, no such philosophy has yet emerged. It is this fact *alone*, that has allowed Marxism to flourish and grow to such proportions.

Engels the friend of Marx and the co-creator of his philosophy said a hundred years ago :

"Ideals are but the distorted reflections of economic conditions."

Again he declared :—

"Ideals have no history, no evolution."

He could have said the same even today with none to contradict him.

Unfortunately, the most eminent among the other writers who have endeavoured to explain the causes and functions of ideals in human nature, I mean, Freud, Adler and McDougall, all of whom belong to this century, have

taken no notice of the Marxist standpoint on the subject, to say nothing of their attempting to expose his error. Far from refuting Marx, they have in a way supported him by assuming that ideals are derived from and subserve one or more of the lower animal impulses of man which have a biological compulsion and the object of which is the maintenance of life.

Moreover, the reasoning of each of these writers is so faulty, leaves so many facts of human nature unexplained and is so much in conflict with the reasoning of the other two writers that while the average intellectual man takes for granted the derived and subservient character of the human urge for ideals (a point on which all of them agree), he is led to conclude that there is more argument and more system in the theory of Marx than there is in the theory of any of these writers and that, in any case, the views of these writers should, on account of their fundamental agreement with Marx, somehow merge into his view.

In the absence of a complete and scientific refutation of Marxism and in their desperation the "free nations" of the world are falling back upon religion as a refuge from Communism and efforts are being made to revive or re-inforce the religious impulse of men and women throughout the world and to utilize it for defence against Communism. Here again it is not being realized, that, not only the philosophy of Karl Marx, but also, the writings of several intellectual heroes of the 'free world' itself, like Darwin, Freud, Adler and McDougall, have already undermined, either intentionally or unintentionally, the foundations of the religious belief to such an extent that it is not at all possible now to revive the religious faith of the modern intellectual man unless we explain the scientific bases of religion and make it rationally powerful enough to hold its own against the intellectual challenge of these philosophers.

Evidently, the opposite of the fundamental hypothesis of Marxism which constitutes its minimum contradiction, is already merged in the central idea of this book and the

questions raised by it are, therefore, no other than those which I have detailed above and answered in this book. This book, therefore, answers fully the description of a *real* or *possible* refutation of Marxism given above.

III

It is high time that the psychologists of the world examined critically the position of Marx and other writers regarding the source and purpose of ideals in human nature and settled once for all the question whether it is economic conditions that determine ideals or it is ideals that determine economic conditions. If Marx is wrong, it is for them not only to tell the world how this is so but also *to give the alternative correct view of the place of ideals in human nature.* The challenge of Marx to the scholars of human nature has already stood too long without an answer and the silence of these scholars has already brought the world face to face with a huge catastrophe. Whatever our creeds or ideals, whether we are Communists or otherwise, we are all human beings and have a common irresistible desire to follow Truth, wherever it may be found, provided it is found in a form in which it is clear and intelligible enough to enable us to recognise it. If one half of the world believes in Communism to-day and the other half is opposed to it and if the two halves of the world appear to be ready to enter into the most dreadful war of History against each other, the fault is that of the psychologists who have hitherto failed to give a clear and scientific explanation of the place of ideals in human nature.

In view of this, I present my own thesis, which constitutes the central idea of this book (*viz.* that the urge for ideals is the real, the ultimate and the sole dynamic power of human action) for their consideration. In case it is found to be true and there is a general agreement on it, I am sure it will not only create a world-wide intellectual atmosphere in which Communism will soon wither away of itself, without any body having to fire a shot, but also

bring peoples of different beliefs and ideals closer together for the creation of a new, free, peaceful and prosperous world. If this idea really explains and orders all the known facts of existence *as no other idea can do*—I, on my part, have endeavoured all along to show that such is actually the case—it will be indeed a definite proof of its validity.

All eminent thinkers of this age agree that the existing chaos in world-affairs, fraught with the possibility of a total collapse of civilization and even of a total extinction of the human race is traceable to a single cause and that is the absence of our knowledge of human nature particularly of the principles of human motivation. This is the cause also why human and social sciences which we need so badly now for our guidance in all social and political problems, have not hitherto developed into real sciences. Writes McDougall:—

"Our ignorance of the nature of man has prevented and still prevents the development of all the social sciences. Such sciences are the crying need of our time; for lack of them our civilization is threatened gravely with decay and perhaps complete collapse."

"We talk of Psychology, of Economics and of Political Science, of Jurisprudence, of Sociology and of many other supposed sciences; but the simple truth is that all these fine names simply mark great gaps in our knowledge—they vaguely indicate regions of vast wilderness hardly yet explored—yet regions which must be reduced to order if our civilization is to endure."

"My thesis is that in order to restore the balance of our civilization we need to have far more knowledge (systematically ordered or scientific knowledge) of human nature and of the life of society than we yet have."

"Here then is the only road to remedy the parlous and ever more dangerous state of our civilization. We must actively develop our social sciences into real sciences of human nature and its activities. . . The task of

finding a basis and providing a methodology for the social sciences is far more pressing to-day than it has ever been."

"What, then, in practical terms is the remedy? I can give my answer, most concisely, by suggesting what I would do if I were a dictator. . . . I would, by every means, seek to divert all our most powerful intellects from the physical sciences to research in the human and social sciences".

(*'World Chaos'* by McDougall, pages, 9, 59, 112, 115.)

Under the existing circumstances, therefore, any fresh view of the principles of human motivation, whether it comes from the East or West, deserves all the more the serious consideration of all psychologists. Let them examine the case for the central idea of this book and find out whether it makes or does not make any real contribution to evloving a science of human nature and providing a basis and a methodology for the reconstruction of social sciences on which, according to McDougall, and according to all thinking men, the very life of this civilization now depends. If this idea is true, then it is certain, that, besides disproving Marxism and all wrong isms finally, it unravels the long standing mystery of the human being and along with it the mystery of the Universe.

M. R. D.

Chapter I

CONSCIOUSNESS THE ULTIMATE REALITY

Commonsense regards the world as consisting of two different things, matter and mind. Matter is inert and lifeless. You can push a chair or take it back, remove it from one place to another, divide it into parts or re-assemble it as you choose. It offers you no resistance. It has no purpose of its own. Such is the case with all "dead" matter.

But mind or consciousness is something that is vastly different from matter. When matter is conscious in the ordinary sense of the word, it is capable of movement and action, guided or commanded by a purpose and controlled from within. If you want to control the movements of an animal, you have to adopt a very intricate process based on the study of animal behaviour in response to external stimuli and even then the success is illusory. The animal has its own ends to follow. Purposive action is therefore considered to be a characteristic of consciousness, a quality which matter does not possess.

In spite of this apparently radical difference between mind and matter, philosophers and scientists, owing perhaps, to an unconscious intuitive conviction that ultimately the Universe must be a single reality, have endeavoured to prove the fundamental identity of the two, holding either that mind is really a form of matter or that matter is essentially a manifestation of mind. While the scientists, at least those of the nineteenth century, have generally inclined to the former view, the philosophers have mostly asserted the truth of the latter in one form or the other.

To the scientists of the nineteenth century matter was something permanent and real and according to them, therefore, nothing could be real, the properties of which were not like those of matter, *i.e.*, which could not be seen or touched or subjected to experiments in the laboratory like matter. It was only natural therefore that they regarded mind as a property of living matter and disbelieved that any thing like amind could be the cause of the Universe or could have any thing to do with the phenomena of nature. Mind was according to them a characteristic of a peculiar type of matter acquiring by chance a particular chemical composition and subject to particular laws of Physics.

Among the old scientists the genius of Lord Kelvin (1824-1907) came to the conclusion that nature was not without some thing of the attributes of a mind and that there was a creative and directive force operating in the Universe. But Philosophy, never content like Science with a sectional and fragmentary view of Reality and to a large extent free from the restrictions of the purely scientific method in its search after truth, always insisted that a coherent and consistent explanation of the Universe so eagerly desired by man was impossible without giving a prominent place to consciousness.

Consciousness in God and Universe is the one great subject of not only the mediaeval philosophy, the object of which was to rationalise Christian theology but also of the great modern philosophic theories of Descartes, Leibniz, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Kant, Spinoza, Hegel, Fichte, Croce and Bergson, in which it is treated under the various titles of God, the Universal Spirit, the Absolute, the Absolute Idea, Mental Activity, World-will, the Eternal Mind, Monads, Self, Elan Vital, etc. The first serious challenge of philosophy to scientific materialism however came from Bishop George Berkeley of England who contended that the material world cannot have an independent existence because we can

know it only with the help of our perception which is an experience of the mind. Since the physical world, as we perceive it, has no existence apart from mind what really exists is mind and not the physical world. What we perceive is not matter but certain qualities of colour, form, shape, sound, hardness, etc., and in order that these qualities should exist as we know them to exist they have to be perceived by the mind. Without mind nothing would exist. The reality of the physical world is, therefore, mind or consciousness. In the light of his theory Berkeley argues the existence of an Eternal Mind as follows :—

"All the choir of heaven and furniture of earth, in a word, all those bodies which compose the mighty frame of the world have not any substance without the mind.... So long as they are not actually perceived by me or do not exist in my mind or that of any other created spirit, they must have either no existence at all or else subsist in the mind of some Eternal Spirit."

The subjective idealism of Berkeley has been strongly supported in modern times by the school of Neo-Idealism of which the chief exponents are two Italian philosophers, Beneditto Croce and Giovanni Gentile. Both of these philosophers hold that the Universe is nothing but mind or spirit. Their system is not only the most recent but, according to many philosophers, also one of the most original and the most remarkable developments of modern philosophy. It is based on the hypothesis that the experience of our mind is the only reality of which we can be certain. It leads to the logical conclusion that the reality of the Universe, if it is anything which can be known by the human mind, must be similar to our own mental experience. As self-consciousness is the clearest and the highest mental experience, the reality of the Universe must be of the type of self-consciousness.

As already mentioned the scientists of the nineteenth century could not accept any ideas of this kind, as they

knocked out the very foundation of their physical laws. When the axioms of Newtonian Physics were first questioned by Berkeley, he was met by a scornful derision by the scientists but who could have known that in the controversy whether mind or matter was real the philosopher was soon to have the better of the scientists and that also through the weapons made accessible by the discoveries of the scientists themselves. Philosophers had always insisted on a spiritual explanation of the Universe. If their view-point could not receive a general acceptance, it was due mainly to the hinderance of science. But thanks to the Theory of Relativity, the Quantum Theory and the discovery of some facts of Biology, that hinderance has now ceased to exist and materialism, the idol of science, has received a shattering blow from science itself. The discoveries of Physics have reduced matter (once a hard, simple, obvious fact), and along with it energy, motion, space, time and ether, to an absolute nothing. "Modern matter", to quote Dr. Joad "is something infinitely attenuated and elusive ; it is a hump in space-time, a mush of electricity, a wave of probability undulating into nothingness, frequently it is not matter at all but a projection of the consciousness of its perceiver."

Professor Roughier, while discussing the implications of Relativity Theory, says in his book 'Philosophy and New Physics':—

"Thus matter is resolved into electrons which themselves vanish in etherised undulations, so that there is a final loss of matter, and an uncompensated dissipation of energy. For the universal principle of invariance which the Ionic natural philosophers placed at the basis of natural philosophy and which assured its in-telligibility namely 'nothing is created nothing is lost', one must now substitute the contrary principle 'nothing is created everything is lost'. The world marches towards a final bankruptcy and the ether, of which it has been asserted in vain that it is the matrix of the worlds, is revealed as being their final tomb".

Dr. Harry Schmidt in his book "Relativity and Uni-

verse" is almost touched with despair while giving an account of the universe as it was discovered to be when the theory of Relativity entered into the scheme of things. "Space and time", says he "sank to shadows, motion itself–became meaningless, the shape of bodies a matter of view point, and the world ether was banished for ever.

Woe, woe
Thou hast destroyed
The beautiful world
With violent blow.
'Tis shivered 'tis shattered
The fragments abroad by a demi-god scattered
Now we sweep
The wrecks into nothingness
Fondly we weep
The beauty that is gone."

But, if matter is not real and permanent, facts point to the existence of a better entity than dead matter as a substitute for it, that is, a Living Creator. For how are we to account otherwise, for all the rich variety of creation in which there is beauty, art, design, purpose, harmony and accurate mathematical thinking. These are surely the attributes of consciousness which must be the sole reality of the Universe. It is evident therefore that the disappearance of matter has not only cleared the way for a spiritual explanation of the world but has also made it indispensable. To assume a metaphysical reality of the Universe is, today, at least as imperative as it was in the nineteenth century to assume that the Universe was nothing but matter. Philosophical thought generally had emphasised all along in its history a spiritual explanation of the Universe independently of science, rather in spite of it. Already this explanation was in no way less convincing than the materialistic explanation and now here was science offering a strong evidence in support of it.

As matter has proved to be unreal, the physicists feel that they are unable to solve the problems of

physics by confining themselves merely to the realm of matter. They are compelled to go beyond the world of matter in their search after truth because now it is there that they hope to discover the reality of matter. Thus we find quite a large number of them in England as well as in Europe, for example, Eddington, Jeans, Whitehead, Einstein, Schrodinger and Planck, attempting to explain the material world from a spiritual point of view; from physicists they have turned into metaphysicists. The reasoning of all these scientists attempts to support the hypothesis that the reality of the Universe is a form of consciousness. Professor Planck, the propounder of the Quantum Theory, remarked in an interview with J.W.N. Sullivan which appeared in the "Observer" of the 26th January 1931: "I regard consciousness as fundamental. I regard matter as derivative from consciousness. We cannot get behind consciousness. Everything that we talk about, everything that we postulate as existing, requires consciousness." Einstein wrote :—

"The Universe is ruled by mind and whether it be the mind of a mathematician or of an artist or of a poet or all of them, it is the one reality which gives meaning to existence, enriches our daily life, encourages our hope and energizes us with faith when knowledge fails."

Sir James Jeans argues that all matter can be reduced to mathematical relations. Mathematics is involved in the constitution of the atom as well as in the systems of heavenly bodies. Laws of Mathematics are strictly obeyed by the nearest physical objects as well as by the most distant parts of the Universe. But all the knowledge of Mathematics that we have, is acquired by us as a result of logical reasoning carried on independently of any reference to nature. Having formulated the laws of Mathematics as a product of our own minds and being guided by our own reasoning powers, when we turn to the physical world, we find not only that it is built up in accordance with these laws but also that these laws are its ultimate nature. Since matter

is unreal, nothing remains of the material Universe ultimately except the laws of Mathematics. How could it be possible for us to discover these laws all by ourselves and how could these laws become involved in the construction of the material world unless it is a fact that the material world is a creation of a mind like our own—a mind that is capable of thinking accurately and mathematically, as we are? Both the external world and our own minds must be the result of the creative activity of this mind.

"The Universe", writes Sir James Jeans in his book "The Mysterious Universe", "cannot admit of material representation and the reason, I think, is, that it has become a mere mental concept......Thirty years ago we thought or assumed that we were heading towards an ultimate reality of a mechanical nature......Today there is wide measure of agreement which on the physical side of science approaches almost to unanimity that the stream of knowledge is heading towards a non-mechanical reality; the Universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine. Mind no longer appears as an accidental intruder into the realm of matter; we are beginning to suspect that we ought rather to hail it as the creator or the governor of the realm of matter—not of course our individual minds but the mind in which the atoms out of which our individual minds have grown exist as thoughts. The new knowledge compels us to revise our hasty first impressions that we had stumbled into a Universe which either did not concern itself with life or was actively hostile to life. The old dualism between mind and matter which was mainly responsible for the supposed hostility seems likely to disappear, not through matter becoming in any way more shadowy or unsubstantial than heretofore or through mind becoming resolved into a function of the working of matter but through substantial matter resolving into a creation and manifestation of mind. We discover that the

Universe shows evidence of a designing and controlling power that has something in common with our own individual minds—not so far as we have discovered, emotion, morality or aesthetic appreciation but the tendency to think in the way which for want of a better word we describe as mathematical. And while much in it may be hostile to the material appendages of life; much also is akin to the fundamental activities of life; we are not so much strangers or intruders in the Universe as we at first thought. Those inert atoms in the primaeval slime which first began to foreshadow the attributes of life were putting themselves more and not less in accord with the fundamental nature of Universe."

Apart from the theories of the Idealist and the Neo-Idealist philosophers and the evidence of new Physics which we have seen to be strongly in favour of a spiritual interpretation of the world, there are some facts of Biology which lead to the same conclusions. Some regular systems of philosophy have developed around these facts. One of these philosophical systems is the theory of Creative Evolution, evolved by Professor Henry Bergson of France. The materialists believe that life is nothing but a property of a particular type of matter that comes to acquire a particular chemical composition. The organism that comes into existence in this way reacts as a sensitive mechanism to the conditions of the environment and the result is that it undergoes a modification in its physical structure. The modification goes on accumulating in the course of ages on account of ever fresh conditions of environment which the organism has to face, with the result that new species continue to appear. But recent developments in the science of Biology do not support this contention.

Serious students of Biology, according to Professor J. S. Haldane, no longer entertain the view that life is merely the result of a definite chemical constitution of matter. The experiments of the German biologist Driesch, in particular, have led to the conclusion that the behaviour

of a living organism in its reaction to the external conditions of environment, is categorically different from the working of a machine. A machine is controlled from outside and is no more than the sum total of a number of parts. An organism exhibits an internal drive to acquire and maintain a particular form or structure of the body. It behaves as a whole with an inner drive which attends to the needs of the whole. When we cut off the leg of a crab, another leg appears in its place. No machine is capable of replacing its broken parts automatically. Driesch cut an embryo into two parts in the earliest stages of its growth, that is, at a time when the tissues are yet plastic and before the cells are irrevocably determined by chemo-differentiation, and found that a portion developed into a complete animal. The results remain the same no matter where the cut is made or what happens to be the relation of the part to the whole. Thus the cells that may have grown to form the head in an individual embryo may grow to form a leg. In fact, any part of the embryo may develop into any limb in accordance with the needs of the whole organism. The question arises: How is it possible for that which is a part to acquire the properties of the whole? The same principle is found to govern the development of the embryonic tissue. If a newt's tail is cut off another tail grows in its place; and, if the tail is cut off early enough and grafted on to the freshly cut stump of a leg, the tail grows into a leg and not into a tail.

Such facts cannot be explained in terms of the physical categories of the Universe. Driesch, therefore, abandoned the attempt to explain the development of the embryo on the assumption that life results from the operation of definite laws of Physics and Chemistry. It was necessary to assign a separate category to processes of life and he, therefore, substituted for the chemico-physical theory a vitalistic theory of entelechies. Driesch concluded that the organism was impelled by a spontaneous drive to reach its appropriate form and to perform its appropriate function.

He assumed that there was an internal regulating principle active in the organism which moulded and formed it in the interests of the whole, changing and directing its purpose to suit these interests. This regulating principle must be interested in the growth and evolution of life. Bergson gives it the name of the *Elan Vital* or the vital impetus and identifies it with consciousness.

The study of life reveals some other facts too which support the conclusions of Driesch. These facts have been adduced by Bergson in his book "Creative Evolution" to show that the inward impulse of life is the cause of the first appearance of animal life on earth and of its reproduction and evolution into higher forms. Lamarck explained the evolution of life as a result of the fact that living beings must be adapted to the conditions of the environment. Adaptation causes a slight alteration in the form of the animal, which alteration is inherited by the offspring, which being itself subjected to the necessity of adaptation undergoes further change. In this way modifications go on accumulating gradually till we have a new species.

For one thing this explanation is incompatible with the facts now well-established that variations may not only be due to an accumulated effect but may also take place suddenly. This is impossible unless there were a conscious or unconscious drive in the organism itself causing it to develop a sudden change and improvement. Secondly, the necessity for adaptation to the conditions of environment is a reason which explains why the evolution of life should stop rather than why it should go on. As soon as a creature has adapted itself to its environment sufficiently to be able to maintain its life, it would not require to change or evolve any further. Adaptation, in so far as it is determined by the need of self-preservation, should explain the arrest of life rather than its progress towards forms of ever higher and higher organisation. "A very inferior organism" says Bergson, "is as well adapted as ours to the conditions of existence, judged by its success in maintaining its

life. Why then does life which succeeds in adapting itself go on complicating itself......more and more dangerously? Some living forms to be met with today have come down unchanged from the remotest palaeozoic times, they have persisted unchanged throughout the ages. Life then might have stopped at some one definite form. Why did it not stop wherever it was possible? Why has it gone on, why, unless it be that there is an impulse driving it to take ever greater and greater risks towards its goal of an ever higher and higher efficiency?"

Such facts lend support to the view that consciousness does not emanate from matter but has an independent existence of its own, that it is fundamental and not a derivative from the properties of matter. If consciousness is a reality by itself, it is but a step to the inference that it is the sole reality of the Universe, matter itself having emanated from it. Matter, no less than organic life, has evolved in the course of ages. That inner drive which has been responsible for the maintenance and evolution of organic life must be responsible for the evolution of matter as well, so that matter too is a form of consciousness. And, we must recall, this conclusion is eminently supported by the discoveries of modern Physics.

What are the qualities of consciousness? Whatever may be the qualities of consciousness, they are certainly expressed in the creation and we can deduce them by a careful study of the Universe around us. The highest form of creation in which consciousness expressed itself is man. We can therefore infer that the qualities of the human being, at his best and in the state of his highest evolution, should be akin to the qualities of consciousness, with this obvious difference that the qualities of consciousness must be of the highest perfection. This point will be elucidated further on in one of the chapters that follow.

Sir James Jeans with the caution of a scientist admits only one quality of his Universal Mind, that of intelligence and mathematical thought, the only quality which could

be established and which has been established scientifically or mathematically. But naturally, when you grant one attribute of consciousness to an entity you cannot resist the conclusion that it must have all the attributes with which consciousness is associated in our own knowledge. Sir James Jeans concludes that the Universal Mind is a mind like our own in the quality of mathematical thinking but there is no reason why it should not be a mind like our own, in other qualities as well. In our own experience we have never known mathematical thinking to exist in a mind independently of ethical qualities. The highest intelligence indicates the highest form of consciousness which is self-consciousness. Ethical qualities always go with the quality of self-observation, so far as we know. Consciousness, therefore, cannot be merely a quality of mathematical thinking. Consciousness is self-consciousness. It is aware of itself and is, therefore, a Personality or Self. It is inseparable from the qualities of Power, Truth, Goodness and Love. Our nature, because of the fundamental similarity of the human mind with the Universal Mind, is such that we love to own these qualities and in as much as they are lovable to us they can be described by one word, Beauty. In the succeeding chapters there will be an attempt to give a fuller treatment of the nature and qualities of consciousness. In view of what has been said above we shall use the words Life, Consciousness, Self-consciousness or only Self for the entity which we have found to be the ultimate reality of the Universe.

Chapter II

CREATION AND EVOLUTION

The Universe is a creation of consciousness since we have known that its fundamental nature is a conscious process. The world did not come into existence suddenly as a finished product but it was created to acquire its present shape gradually by a process of evolution. Creation took the form of evolution because all creation, whether human or divine, takes this form.

If we trace back the evolutionary process step by step, we reach a stage when there was only matter and no organic life, and then a stage when there was only energy and no matter in the ordinary sense of the word and finally a stage when there was only consciousness and nothing else besides it. Matter consists of electrons and protons which are packets of waves of electric energy. All matter is thus reducible to energy and energy is destructible according to modern views of Physics. The process of creation was therefore started by consciousness and kept in a state of continuity by consciousness. Sir James Jeans came to the conclusion that the reality of the Universe is the thought of a Creator but it is evident that this thought must have its source in the Creator's urge or desire for creation. This desire is realizing itself in the process of evolution exactly as the creative urge of an artist realises itself in the form of a growing picture. This desire has appeared as a powerful current of consciousness or a stream of creative activity flowing in the direction of its choice. It is the cause of evolution which manifests itself in the animal stage of evolution in the form of the *elan vital* or the vital impetus of Bergson and in the human stage as the unconscious urge or the *libido* of Freud.

Why did consciousness create the Universe at all?

The answer to this question is that the creative activity of consciousness and the direction that it chose must be due to a natural and automatic self-expression on its part, to a spontaneous functioning of its qualities and attributes. It was in the nature of consciousness to create and to create in the form and manner in which it did. It does not mean that its nature does not permit the creation of other universes of different kinds as well. Rather we can assume very reasonably that other universes of the same kind as this or of different kinds may have been created by it in the past and may be created by it in the future. We should certainly suppose that an artist who is able to paint one beautiful picture has the talents to produce many other pictures of different kinds as well. Like the Pantheists we cannot identify the Universe with the creating consciousness. The picture is different from the artist, the speech is different from the speaker and the book is different from the writer, each of whom is able to produce many pictures, deliver many speeches and write many books. The Creator is apart from the Universe which is his creation and manifestation as the artist is apart from his picture which he creates and in which he manifests his creative genius.

In the case of the present Universe, according to what science has discovered so far, the first object of which we can have any knowledge with the help of our senses, that came into existence through the creative activity of consciousness, was energy in the form of a kind of light known as cosmic rays, which filled the space by its radiation. That there is nothing that can exceed the speed of light is perhaps an indication that all material objects have evolved out of energy. Energy formed itself into packets of waves of positive and negative charges known as electrons and protons which in their turn combined to form atoms of various complexity. The simplest atom is that of Hydrogen and consists of one electron and one proton. The atoms of other elements are of various

degrees of organization and complexity. In the beginning the Universe was in a gaseous state and took the form of a huge revolving cloud or nebula. This mighty nebula split up, in the course of rotation, into a number of smaller nebulae. Each nebula broke up again into a group of stars or a stellar system. The stellar system which came into existence as a result of the splitting up of the galactic nebula contains the sun around which revolves our earth.

Thus, in the course of ages, matter was able to evolve into higher and higher states through the creative activity or the driving force of the desire of consciousness, till finally it developed all the physical laws which are known to us at present. The period of time during which this development has taken place, that is, the period from the beginning of time to the formation of earth is estimated at 200×10^{12} years.

We have seen that, although life and matter appear to us to be different from each other, the reality of both is one —consciousness. Moreover, matter has an urge of behaviour, however fixed and stereotyped it may be, and behaviour is a characteristic of life. The German philosopher Liebniz believed that matter consists of conscious microscopic particles which he called monads. Particular evidence of a sort of consciousness characterizing matter is afforded by the atomic activity that takes place in the course of a chemical action when the atoms seem to behave as if they know what they should do, or in the course of the process of crystallization when molecules of each substance form themselves automatically into crystals of definite geometrical shapes.

As blood runs through the veins of a living organism, so a current of life runs through all matter although it may appear to us to be dead. It is alive because it has properties on account of which it acts and behaves automatically. It responds to outside situations and stimuli as the animal or the human being does. Its activity, no doubt, follows definite laws which are studied by the physicist and the

chemist We cannot, however, take it to be dead but rather must take it to be alive for this reason. The activity of the animal and of man also proceeds in accordance with definite principles which are studied by the behaviourist and the psychologist. When a batsman hits a cricket ball, the ball bounds off to a distance. The batsman has responded to a situation or stimulus and the ball has done the same. If the ball had been utterly lifeless, the game of cricket would have been impossible. Response to situations and stimuli is a characteristic of life. It is because matter is alive, conscious and intelligent that it is intelligible to us and we are in a position to deal with it. Again, if growth may be considered to be a distinctive property of life, then matter is not without this property too since matter has grown out of its stage of material energy (which may be regarded as its seed) into its present condition. The present form of matter in all its varieties was implied in the original material energy no less than the tree with its branches, leaves, flowers and fruit is implied in the seed out of which it grows and no less than the various physical and psychological characteristics of an individual are implied in the genes and chromosomes out of which his development takes place. Matter is not dead. All that we can say is that the animal is at a higher stage of life than matter, just as man is at a higher stage of life than the animal.

Matter is life from another point of view as well. There could have been no organic life without matter and its laws. It is on account of the operation of the physical laws that the sun shines, the winds blow, the clouds rain, the rivers flow, the seasons change and the days and nights alternate. The laws of matter seem to have been designed, consciously or unconsciously, in order to make possible the appearance and the evolution of life on earth in the form and manner in which it did, because we find that exceptions to the general laws whenever they were of a vital importance have not been ignored. It is a general principle, for example, that all fluids contract when cooled but water

expands when cooled below 4°C with the result that ice is lighter than water and floats on its surface. But for this apparently insignificant fact, which is a departure from a general rule, organic life on earth would have been impossible, as all the oceans and lakes on this planet would have frozen from top to bottom. Such examples can be multiplied. We find, therefore, that matter, along with the urge of behaviour that it has evolved, forms the only suitable environment in which life could have taken its birth, grown and evolved.

Favourable environment is so indispensable to the life of an organism, however small it may be, that Professor Haldane and a few other biologists maintain that an organism must be considered as a whole made up of the body and the environment which act and react on each other in perfect co-ordination. Environment is thus a part of life. When the first living cell came into existence, it found a favourable environment for its continued existence and evolution already prepared and finished. Although the amoeba was directly affected by only a part of its surroundings, yet this part was not isolated but existed within a big whole which was the Universe itself. Thus the whole of the Universe which confronted the amoeba, when it came into existence, was its environment and therefore a part of itself. The birth of the amoeba was due to the fact that matter throughout the Universe had taken the shape and evolved the properties that it had. The Universe evolved itself into what it did in order to prepare the way for the appearance of this tiny cell. The life process or the activity of consciousness which at last centred itself in this little animal was at work even before it came into existence and that was why it did come into existence at all. All activity of life in the past had no other purpose, conscious or unconscious, except to create this little animal. The evolution of life, therefore, dates from the very beginning of creation. The appearance of the amoeba was not the beginning of life. It was only the beginning of a new career of life of which the past was

what we understand as matter.

We do not know whethr there is life anywhere else in the Universe but, if there is, it must be fundamentally and withsmall variations similar to life on this planet. The reason is that life in the first definite stage of its evolution *i.e.*, matter, is the same throughout the Universe.

Since the environment of organic life *i.e.*, matter, came into existence first and the organic life afterwards as a natural growth out of it, we conclude that what we call 'environment' is only life in an earlier stage of its development. Between "life" and matter the only difference is that of the stage of evolution of the same thing—life. The relation of matter to the organic life that came later on is the same as that of the stem of a tree to its branch ; and we know that fundamentally the stem of a tree is not different from the branch that shoots out of it subsequently. The environment of life at a particular stage. is in fact always the whole of the past of life at that stage The most important part of the environment of life, at any stage, is that stage of its evolution which has just preceded this stage, because it is the most immediate determinant of the stage that comes next. The environment of life is the past of life and is indispensable to the future of life. Life creates its own environment and then outgrows it by acting and reacting upon it. The Universe is like a living organism outgrowing every stage of its own growth.

Because matter offers resistance to life, it is not for this reason a separate entity. Life that has grown always offers resistance to life that has yet to grow; the resistance that life offers to its own future growth is indispensable to its evolution and growth. Struggle with itself is life's process of evolution. Life grows by breaking the resistance of its own present. It is always outgrowing itself. Like a tree it grows because every stage of its growth is superseded by a stage of fresh growth.

Matter is primitive life and the laws governing it are fixed tendencies developed by it just as instincts have been

developed by the animal. They represent the affinities of matter acquired by a process of evolution, carried forward by the creative activity of consciousness. The search for affinities is a characteristic of all life. It is to be found in matter, in the animal and in man. Physical laws are victories won by consciousness in the course of its struggle to evolve itself. They are immutable, not because they were always so but because they do not need to change now. They kept changing and growing for a long time in the past and, when they had evolved themselves into a form most suitable for the higher developments of life, they became fixed and automatic, while change manifested itself at higher levels of life. Life changes only at its growing point. When life has finished its growth in any direction, it becomes set and fixed wherever it has reached.

Bergson has shown by a series of highly ingenious arguments that the evolution of life in various directions in the animal stage was due to an internal push or drive of consciousness by means of which consciousness wanted to realize all its potentialities. The efforts of the creature to the extent to which it was itself conscious brought this push or drive more and more into play so that consciousness was able to extend its foothold, to establish itself and express itself increasingly in the creature. Life that actually evolved did so in spite of resistance as well as on account of it. Whenever the creature was faced with resistance, it increased its efforts and thereby also the force of the internal push or drive, so that the obstacles were never able to check the drive of consciousness but rather consciousness was always able to realize its possibilities more and more on account of them. The direction which the development of the creature takes, even when it is due to its own efforts, is determined by the inherent possibilities or the potentialities of consciousness. When a creature is unable to develop in a direction consistent with the aspirations of consciousness, in other words, when it is unable to develop in the right direction, its progress comes

to a stop; and, as it is no longer wanted by life, it becomes gradually extinct. Many species that came into existence disappeared from the face of the earth in this way. To the extent to which consciousness has not been able to express itself in matter at any stage of evolution it depends upon its own powers for carrying on the process of evolution and to the extent to which it has expressed itself in matter in the form of living organisms and is represented by conscious creatures on earth, it makes use of those creatures to serve its purpose of future evolution. To the extent the creature serves it, the creature prospers, improves, progresses, evolves, and draws into itself the hidden powers of consciousness. It must be the same vital impulse, the same current of consciousness which made possible the evolution of life during the animal stage, that was passing through matter in the material stage, changing it and carrying it forward till the birth of the amoeba became possible.

The appearance of the amoeba was a momentous event in the history of life because now life embarked on an entirely new career which constituted the second definitely marked stage of its evolution. At this point life broke the resistance of matter and its laws for the first time—laws which had no doubt helped its evolution to the stage that it had reached but which were nevertheless an obstacle to its future growth. The amoeba was able to make movements which "dead" matter could not, because matter was hindered by an obstacle — that of the physical laws. The drive of consciousness shattered this obstacle and the result was the birth of the amoeba, a small organism in which life now centred itself. This organism could move and act in opposition to the physical laws. It was, therefore, a wonder of creation when it first came into existence. Life was going to make this animal a passage in order to pass on to a fuller realization of itself. The amoeba, therefore, developed tendencies of behaviour which we call instincts, by means of which it was able to

preserve its own life as well as to continue it in the offspring. It was only in this way that it could continue the efforts of life to realize its possibilities.

Life had yet much ground to cover. Although it had broken the resistance of matter it had not yet broken it completely and had succeeded only at one point. The subsequent achievements of life in the animal stage go to show that, when it reached the unicellular stage, heavy restrictions of matter were still clinging to it, restrictions which it was able to overcome only gradually. The effort involved in the expression and exercise of the two fundamental instincts of feeding and procreation enabled the tiny creature to enlarge its powers in the course of time on account of the impetus or drive of consciousness. This gradually brought into existence more and more developed forms of life capable of satisfying their fundamental instincts for the preservation of life and race much more efficiently and made possible an increasing differentiation of these fundamental instincts into a larger number of other tendencies which were inherent in the nature of consciousness.

It is an important point to remember that no tendency of life could come into existence in the form of an instinct which did not exist already in the nature of consciousness and which therefore life could not express. The evolution of species is not caused merely by the animal's struggle for existence as Darwin and Lamarck have supposed. If this had been so, evolution would have proceeded in any direction and every direction indefinitely. But there are innumerable species that have ceased to evolve since long ; they are discovered to have come down to us unaltered from a distant past. An animal, therefore, that is fit to survive is not always fit to evolve. We can never hope the race of horses to evolve into a race of men or supermen. The evolution of such species has come to a dead stop, no doubt, because their efforts to live do not favour the aspirations of consciousness any longer. The evolution of species is due more fundamentally to the push, the drive or the urge of

consciousness to express more and more of its own possibilities. The efforts of the creature simply bring this drive more and more into play and when they are unable to favour this drive no evolution results from them. In such a case the species is left to continue in the form it has reached or else to perish gradually.

When a gramaphone record is playing, the voice is produced by the vibrations of the diaphragm in the soundbox caused by the movements of the needle. The needle is being pushed up and down by the undulations in the groove of the record in which a particular voice singing a particular song exists in a potential form. Supposing, a scientist from the Mars has such limited powers of vision that, while he is able to see the sound-box and the needle, he is unable to see the disc and therefore the groove and the undulations in the groove over which the needle is moving. He will explain the final cause of the sound as being the movements of the needle. He will be unable to realize that it is only when the movements of the needle conform to a particular plan that they are able to produce the melody and that, if the movements were to depart from that plan, the melody would be discontinued at once. While he will be sure that the movements of the needle are causing the melody, he will be unable to say why they are causing it. His explanation will be correct but it will not go far enough ; it will be incomplete.

Equally incomplete, though equally correct, must be the explanation of that scientist who declares in the case of the evolution of species that it is the efforts of the creature that cause an increasing variation in its body-structure resulting in a new species. He does not explain why the creature's efforts cause variations of form in certain cases and not in others. The fact is that just as the movements of the needle produce the melody when they are consistent with a particular scheme residing in the gramaphone record, so the efforts of the creature cause a variation of its physical form only when they

are consistent with the possibilities latent in the nature of consciousness. Just as the ultimate cause of the melody lies in the invisible potentialities of the disc which is shaking the needle for their expression, so the ultimate cause of evolution lies in the unseen potentialities of consciousness which is pushing the process forward for its own realization. Life is expressing only those tendencies in the instincts of the evolving species which exist already in its nature.

As the instincts developed, consciousness was able to express itself in matter more and more. Although the instincts multiplied and thereby gave a greater and greater expression to life, as life developed into higher and more organized forms, yet all of them arose in the service of the organism, that is, in the service of its two fundamental instincts of the preservation of life and race. As the instincts multiplied, they simply enabled the creature to have more and more complicated ways of maintaining its life and race. The development of instincts took place as much on account of the need and effort of the creature to live as on account of the need and effort of consciousness to express itself. Instincts are, therefore, the expression of the inherent tendencies and qualities of consciousness. Life, no doubt, complicated and organized itself and gained new powers by developing new instincts but every new instinct that it developed was only a fixed, inflexible tendency to which the creature had to respond out of a necessity, whenever a situation forming an adequate stimulus for that instinct was created.

The tendencies involved in the instincts were all present latently in consciousness from the very beginning but some of them developed more clearly and became more powerful in one direction than in another, owing to the circumstances the creature had to face and the consequent efforts that it had to put forth. That gave rise to a very rich variety of life. Although in this way life increased its powers, it was not able to use them as it pleased.

In other words, life was unable to oppose its own instincts. Life was thus, owing to the instincts, under restrictions, akin to the restrictions of the physical laws, although the former permitted a far greater freedom to life than the physical laws did.

As life had not yet obtained its complete liberation from matter, its career was that of a hard struggle against the restrictions imposed by it. In its efforts to realize its latent possibilities it turned right and left and developed along various routes of evolution. As a result of its struggle innumerable new species were always coming into existence, sometimes suddenly and sometimes by a prolonged, gradual process. Although it met resistance at every step, yet, on the whole, it succeeded in overcoming it and thus winning victory after victory it pushed forward on the road of self-expression. It is true that here and there a species was faced with a resistance that proved too great for it, so that the species succumbed to it and disappeared from the face of the earth. But the failure of life in one direction was always more than compensated by its success in other directions. Life never lost any of its achievements secured along one route of evolution which it did not take care to preserve along some other route, which means that life never met with a real failure. It continued to evolve slowly and hesitatingly but steadily and constantly.

The destination of life was far off, although it was approaching nearer and nearer to it every moment. Long before it reached anywhere close to it, its progress came to a dead stop along every route of evolution except one — that which was leading to man. On all these routes it developed certain tendencies of its nature more in one direction than in certain others. Although in this manner it dropped some of its achievements on the way, yet since it was keeping up its progress along one route at least, it was sure to realize them all soon in the course of its evolution along that route. We can imagine that when man will reach perfection, he will manifest in a harmonious

combination the fundamentals of all those tendencies which life has developed in other species but not yet in man.

It was after a struggle of millions of years (the period of time between the appearance of the first organism and the appearance of man is estimated at 500×10^6 years) that life succeeded in installing itself finally in the human form.

Much waste for the sake of a precious gain seems to be a characteristic of the process of evolution. Sometimes we misinterpret it as cruelty or purposelessness in nature but the fact is that in this case the end justifies the means. There would be no gain unless there is loss. Since the gain is valuable, it more than compensates for the loss. Creation takes the form of choosing, out of innumerable possibilities open to life to express itself, that possibility which happens to be the most potent for its future aspirations and the possibilities are ascertained by nature to be potent or otherwise in the actual experiment of creation. Life expresses itself in innumerable forms and then favours one form that is most promising for the future, permitting all other forms to perish or to linger on without evolving. It does not follow a chalked out programme. That would be imitation and not creation. Its programme is made in action as it proceeds. Creation is free action. It is similar to what happens in our own case. Before choosing a line of action we think of several possibilities and reject all but one. But, while we may think and reject without acting, for consciousness thinking is acting and creating. Life is under no restrictions as we are. It is free to express and create all its possibilities out of which it chooses and preserves the one that is most promising of all. Life has to reject that part of its creation which lacks promise and fertility for the future and to support and continue that part through which it can keep up its progress. Freedom of action does not preclude the knowledge of future events on the part of consciousness. Consciousness is above time and for it future is as good as present. The fact that consciousness has not chalked out programme of creation

and yet knows the details of future events looks like a logical contradiction. This fact, indeed, cannot be grasped by reason in the ordinary sense of the term; the self can realize it only directly and intuitively at a very high stage of self-consciousness, a stage which we shall study later on in this book.

Has life entered a new stage of evolution on reaching man or is the human stage a continuation of the animal stage? In other words, is the difference between a man and an animal a difference of degree or a difference of kind, a difference as radical as one finds *e.g.*, between matter and animal? We believe that man is far superior to the animal. But in what does his superiority consist? The special achievement of life when it stepped into the animal stage was to develop an urge of instincts by means of which it was able to oppose the urge of matter, that is, the physical laws. It is this achievement that makes the animal so different from matter. What is it specially that life has achieved on entering the human stage? If we ascertain it, we ascertain what the object of life could be in organizing and complicating itself ever more and more and pushing itself ever forward through the animal stage in the course of millions of years, in spite of innumerable hardships and difficulties that it had to face. That object must include the object of creation itself; it must provide us with a clue to understanding the aim and the destination of life for the future.

Bergson rightly insists that the difference between a man and an animal is not one of degree but of kind. You cannot say that an animal is a lower kind of man or that man is a higher kind of animal. Consciousness which remains still imprisoned in the forms of life just below man gets its freedom all at once in the human form. There is only a very small difference of complexity and size between the brain of an ape and the brain of a man but the result of this small difference is very great. "In the animal" writes Bergson, "the motor mechanisms that the brain succeeds in setting up or, in the other words, the habits contracted

voluntarily, have no other object nor effect than the accomplishment of the movements marked out in those habits, stored in these mechanisms. But, in man, the motor habit may have a second result out of proportion to the first ; it can hold other motor habits in check and thereby in overcoming automatism set consciousness free."

To use a similie of Bergson again, imagine a mechanism which requires the continuous attention of an operator to work it by turning a handle. If the operator finds one day that the handle can be moved automatically when it is tied with a chord to one of the wheels in the mechanism, what a difference it must create. The mechanism remains exactly the same in both cases but, while formerly it engaged the continuous attention of the operator, it is possible for the operator now to divert his attention from it to other things that he may like to do.

That in man consciousness has been liberated from the constraint of matter means no more than this that it has become free to look to itself, to know itself. It has achieved both freedom and self-knowledge. For consciousness knowledge is freedom and freedom is knowledge. Freedom and knowledge are two different names of one and the same thing. While the animal is only conscious, that is, it can know, feel and think, man is self-conscious. He can not only know, feel and think but he can also know that he knows, feels and thinks. This makes a huge difference. On account of this superiority enjoyed by man over the animal, man can oppose his instinctive desires, while an animal, cannot.

We conclude, therefore, that the goal of consciousness in undergoing a process of evolution was to become self-conscious, that is, to obtain freedom and self-knowledge. Reaching man, life, on account of its newly acquired gift of self-consciousness, was enabled to break the resistance of the instincts.

Is the forward movement of life to continue or has it come to a stop having reached its goal in man ?

The process of evolution must continue as long as the world lasts. The vital impulse has reached many goals in the past. It reached a new goal every day, every hour, and every minute of its life. Each goal that it reached brought within sight another goal which it again set out to achieve. It did not stop because it could not stop; such is the nature of life. Its present goal too is a stepping stone to innumerable other goals which lie ahead.

Life must continue to unroll and unfold itself for ever. It can never come to a stop. The secret of consciousness is that it must change and change always. The very fact that we live and that the world continues, changing violently all around us, is an indication that the expression of consciousness has not yet reached its perfection and that consciousness has yet to display much of its latent splendour.

As soon as this Universe has reached its perfection, it must vanish and then another Universe may come into existence. To create is an eternal characteristic of consciousness and, having finished one universe, the Creator, we assume, may begin another, as an artist who has completed one picture may start another.

The aim of consciousness is to obtain freedom and self-knowledge for itself and it has not yet attained to the maximum of that freedom and that self-knowledge which it is possible for it to attain. It has yet to know a lot of itself. When the first amoeba came into existence, it was a wonder of creation. It could move, however little, automatically, against the resistance of the physical laws, unlike all other objects. It could feed itself, grow and procreate. But, in spite of its wonderful powers, it represented but a very small fraction of that power, latent in consciousness, which it was able to display later on in monkeys and anthropoids even in the course of its evolution during the animal stage. Similarly, although man is a wonder of creation as compared with the animal, he is but an animal as compared with the morally and spiritually evolved superman of the future. Consciousness has expressed

but a small fraction of itself in man as yet; life has innumerable potentialities waiting to be revealed.

To say that man is a self-conscious animal means only that in him matter cannot and does not obstruct the growth of self-consciousness, such is the evolved construction of his brain, but self-consciousness is yet to grow in him to tremendous dimensions.

If the forward movement of life is to continue indefinitely what is going to be its future ?

The following three facts about the future evolution of life are evident :—

Firstly, that consciousness will press forward in future through man and man alone. Its movement has already come to an end along all other lines of evolution. At present the most highly developed form of life is man. Man is, therefore, the only thoroughfare along which life can continue its progress indefinitely.

Secondly, the future evolution of consciousness will consist in its ever getting greater and greater freedom and self-knowledge. What it will achieve for the future must be of the same nature as that which it has achieved in the past. In order that the impulse of life may be consistent with itself, its future must be in line with its past, that is, it must preserve its past achievements and go on adding to them in future. What it has achieved so far is self-knowledge and what it will achieve in future must be only in the nature of further additions to self-knowledge.

Thirdly, no new species are necessary for the future evolution of life. What is known as the evolution of species is really the evolution of consciousness, the evolving species with an ever increasing complication of their brain, the organ of consciousness, serving merely as an instrument of this evolution. And the evolution of consciousness in its turn means the evolution of the knowledge of consciousness about itself. Now that the material instrument of consciousness, that is, the physical body and its brain, no longer obstruct consciousness and allow it

the freedom to know itself; consciousness can add to this freedom as much as it likes. No doubt the restrictions of matter, that is, the physical body and its fixed tendencies, the instincts will still weigh on the progress of consciousness but they cannot stop it. Consciousness having once regained some control over itself will know how to make further additions to it.

Just as in the life of a human individual the brain develops from childhood onwards upto a certain limit beyond which it is not the brain but the individual's knowledge that develops, similarly, in the history of life the appearance of new species with a greater and greater development and organization of the brain goes on upto a certain limit — which is the human form of life — and beyond this limit it is not the species or the brain that we can expect to evolve but the human self-consciousness. That man has become self-conscious is an indication that the physical instrument of consciousness, the brain, has reached its perfection in him. The future evolution of man will, therefore, consist in the development of his self-knowledge and not in a still greater development and complication of his brain, or his physical body, as a consequence of the formation of new species.

Chapter III

THE URGE OF INSTINCT AND THE URGE OF SELF

The coming of man was another momentous event in the history of life because now life once again embarked on a fresh career of progress entirely different from that immediately preceding it. On the appearance of the amoeba, life broke the resistance of the physical laws; on the appearance of man it broke the resistance of the instincts. Just as the physical laws had helped the evolution of life but were nevertheless an obstacle to its future growth so the instincts too by assuring the continuation of life and increasing, by their own multiplication, the complexity of the brain had helped its evolution but were nevertheless an obstacle to its future progress. Instincts weighed upon the freedom of life no less than the physical laws did. But with the appearance of man the drive of consciousness at last forced the barrier of the instincts as with the appearance of the amoeba it had forced the barrier of the physical laws in the past. Consciousness was removing layer after layer of its covering of matter in order to unfold its own innermost meaning and here it scored the second great victory of its career. Just as we are justified in regarding matter and its laws as a lower form of life, so we are justified in regarding the animal and its instincts as a higher form of matter. The fixed physical laws which characterize matter are replaced in the animal only by a new variety of fixed tendencies of behaviour which we call instincts.

In man life has broken the resistance of instincts with the result that man can oppose his own instinctive desires.

The animal too can oppose his instincts but its opposition is not the result of voluntary choice. It is always a case of one instinct opposing another, the stronger instinctive impulse defeating the weaker. The opposition of man to his instinctive desires is, however, the result of free choice. He opposes his instinctive impulses in such a way that the impulse of no particular instinct is found to be in the process of satisfaction, during the opposition. So often a man would deliberately starve himself and even give up his life rather than abandon a particular course of action chosen by him. In the case of man we find free consciousness, free choice, opposing the impulses of the instincts.

The animal was able to oppose the resistance of the laws of matter because it had developed and was impelled by the urge of instincts. There must be some urge specially developed by man by virtue of which he is able to oppose the resistance of the instincts. It is only an urge that can oppose another urge, an impulse that can check another impulse. What is that urge or impulse which is the special privilege of man? The philosophers have held so far that the only distinctive capacity of man which gives him superiority over the animal is reason. But reason is not an urge, it is not a desire, not an impulse for action. It serves our urges and desires and may guide them but it cannot rule them or hold them in check, since it is not an urge or a desire itself. That urge, the special privilege of man by virtue of which he is able to oppose his instinctive desires whenever he considers it desirable, is the urge of consciousness itself which the philosophers have sadly overlooked so far. It is the urge which consciousness manifests when it achieves its freedom as it has done in the human form of life. The cause of this urge is the pull of attraction which consciousness feels for consciousness, that is, which free consciousness in the human being feels for its source, the Universal Consciousness. *The principal form of this urge is the love of ideals.*

The urge of consciousness or, which is the same thing, the urge of self-consciousness or self, is as different from the

urge of instincts as the urge of instincts is different from the urge of matter. Just as the urge of instincts is higher than the urge of matter, similarly the urge of consciousness is higher than the urge of instincts. Just as the urge of instincts needs to oppose, assert itself and rule over matter for its own satisfaction, similarly the urge of consciousness needs to oppose, assert itself and rule over instincts for its own satisfaction. The urge which is higher and which is later to develop in the process of evolution rules over the urge which is lower and which develops earlier in each case. The urge which is the last to develop, that is, the urge of consciousness is the strongest and the most important of all and tends to rule both matter and instinct for its own satisfaction.

We are now in a position to enumerate the three distinct *stages of evolution* along with the special achievements of life in each stage as follows :—

(1) The material stage, developing the urge of matter or the physical laws.

(2) The animal stage, developing the urge of the animal or the instincts.

(3) The human stage, developing the urge of consciousness in freedom.

As there are three stages of evolution so there are three *departments of knowledge* or three sciences corresponding to these three stages:

(1) The science of matter or the Physical Science which explains the laws of matter.

(2) The science of the animal or Biology which explains the laws of the animal body.

(3) The science of man or Psychology which explains the laws of the human mind.

Philosophy is an attempt to understand the Psychology of the Consciousness of the Universe. That is why it endeavours to integrate all the sciences into a single whole.

Goal-seeking or striving for a purpose is a characteristic of consciousness. Therefore, as soon as we conclude that the

ultimate reality of the Universe is consciousness, we have to concede that the process of creation or evolution is following a purpose, the causal sequence is not mechanical but telelogical and the nature of the laws of Physical Science, Biology and Psychology must be explained out of the purpose of creation. Since all the laws of nature have developed around a single purpose, which is the purpose of creation, all sciences are organically related to each other and no science can be understood completely in isolation from other sciences.

The urge of consciousness is to realise the purpose of creation. The urge of matter and the urge of the animal are simply the forms in which the urge of consciousness manifested itself at various stages of its own expression. The urge of consciousness achieves its freedom and comes into its own in the human stage of evolution for the first time. Life is more free in the second than in the first stage and more free in the third than in the second stage. The third stage of evolution continues at present and in this stage life will evolve by a greater and greater expression of the urge of consciousness just as in the animal stage it evolved from the amoeba upwards by a greater and greater expression of the urge of instincts.

Instincts have been evolved by consciousness and their object is the continuation of the life of the individual and the race. The urge of consciousness cannot, therefore, be opposed to the urge of instincts by its nature. It opposes the instincts only when it is necessary to do so for its own satisfaction but frequently it finds that it is necessary to support the instincts rather than oppose them for its own satisfaction. Normally, the proper satisfaction of the instincts is essential for the continued satisfaction of the urge of consciousness; because without their satisfaction it would not be possible to preserve the individual and the species of that animal (man) in whom free consciousness has made its appearance. Whenever the normal and necessary satisfaction of the urge of instincts is threatened, the urge of

consciousness attends to the problem in its own interest. Instincts are the means to the satisfaction of the urge of consciousness and they have to be satisfied as means and not as an end in themselves. If they become the end in themselves, they get more satisfaction than it is necessary, defeat their own purpose and interfere with the urge of consciousness. They are having their proper place only as long as they do not thwart the urge of consciousness but help it by maintaining the body of the individual and continuing his offspring.

The instincts serve another useful purpose. They help the evolution of consciousness indirectly by thwarting it and inducing it to make effort. They represent the limitations of matter which consciousness has no doubt broken at one point but which are still clinging to it and retarding its freedom. When life had outgrown matter, its primitive form, matter continued to serve it in two ways. Firstly, it sustained life and made its continuation and evolution possible. Secondly, it enabled life to express and evolve itself by offering it resistance and thereby inducing it to make effort. Now that in man life has outgrown the instincts, instincts still cling to man and render an indispensable service to the evolution of life in two ways. Firstly, they sustain life and make its growth possible. Secondly, they enable life to express and evolve itself by offering it resistance and inducing it to make effort.

Psychologists explain all the activities of man as due to the instincts but it becomes difficult to concur with their view when we consider that man only inherits his instincts from his animal ancesstors and that the nature and function of the instincts in the animal and in man must be the same. Instincts in the animal are but fixed and unalterable tendencies to respond to particular internal or external stimuli in such a way as to assure the continuation of life in the individual animal as well as in its offspring. In man too, the instincts serve the same purpose of the preservation of life and race. Man inherits from the animal not only his

instincts but also their function. The higher activities of man like those actuated by the love of ideals, of aesthetic and moral desires are not due to the instincts. They are due to the urge of consciousness alone. Instincts cannot be expected to become suddenly capable of performing in man any function higher than that for which they originally came into existence, unless they change in character. But certainly they have not changed their character in man. McDougall's definition of an instinct is meant to be applicable equally to man and to the animal. Thus he defines an instinct as "an inherited and innate psycho-physical disposition which determines its possessor to perceive and pay attention to objects of a certain class and experience an emotional excitement of a particular quality upon perceiving such an object and to act in regard to it in a particular manner or at least to experience an impulse to such action".

We must equally rule out the idea that our higher activities have their source in reason or that reason works a miracle with the instinctive desires and transforms them into desires of a higher order. Reason is not a desire nor can it modify the instinctive desires all by itself; it cannot and does not change our desires but only helps their satisfaction. It discovers where our impulses come into conflict with each other and helps us to avoid that conflict, so as to make possible the assertion of the strongest impulse. Whenever an impulse is modified with the help of reason, the modification is due ultimately to some other impulse. It is really the urge of consciousness in us that modifies our instinctive desires and fixes the manner and the limits of their satisfaction. Reason holds the torch to the dimly observing urge of consciousness, guides it and enables it to see in what way it can best satisfy itself.

All our actions are the result of our impulses. Reason serves every impulse equally without changing any one of them directly. We always justify that impulse in us which is the strongest and wants to have mastery over all the other impulses at the time. The strongest impulse in us is

ultimately the impulse for an ideal. It has its source in the urge of consciousness and not in the urge of the instincts. In fact it controls and modifies the instinctive desires. It is sometimes wrong and sometimes right. When it is wrong, it is unable to get a free and continued expression. When it is right, it continues to have a smooth, unhampered and free expression. If this impulse is right, our reasoning will be right; if it is wrong, our reasoning will be wrong. Future evolution depends upon our giving this impulse a free and continued expression. Unfortunately, this impulse has been hitherto ignored or misunderstood by the psychologists and the neglect or the misunderstanding of it has caused all the chaos that exists in the social sciences at present as well as many of the miseries which the human race has suffered so far.

Although the activities of free consciousness are separate from the activities of the instincts, there is no doubt that the instincts represent some of the tendencies involved in the qualities of consciousness. The instincts developed and multiplied because consciousness wanted to express itself. They are however, not free tendencies and are, therefore, easily distinguished from the urge of consciousness of which the characteristic is free, unrestrained activity. The activities of consciousness, characteristic of man alone, are for their own sake and not for the sake of the body except as means to the ends of consciousness sometimes. The urge of consciousness is not entirely absent in the animal. It is rather present in him latently and sub-consciously in its full strength but, on account of the undeveloped condition of his brain or whatever instrument of consciousness he has, it is highly suppressed. It has a negligible expression so that the behaviour of the animal is dominated entirely by his fixed tendencies, the instincts.

The development of consciousness from the humblest creature upwards takes place from a limited and incomplete expression to a more and more elaborate, fuller, richer and

freer expression of the whole consciousness. The qualities of consciousness do not appear in evolution one after the other. The animal never passes through a stage of incoordinated separate expression of some qualities of consciousness in exclusion to the rest of them but expresses all of them at every stage in an integrated form. Only the expression of these integrated qualities becomes fuller and freer with the evolution of the animal. As the psychological background of every action of man represents all the qualities of consciousness with one quality being more dominant than others, so the psychological constitution of an animal consists of all the qualities of consciousness with one quality being more dominant than others. The quality of pugnacity, for example, is dominant in the snake while the quality of courage is dominant in the tiger. Consciousness always expresses itself as a whole. Only its expression becomes clearer and clearer and more and more visible, as if the hole letting out the light of consciousness becomes wider and wider in the course of evolution. As such there is an urge corresponding to the urge for Beauty—over and above the urge of instincts which is necessary for the maintenance of life—present in every insect, bird or animal. This explains the attraction of animals for brilliance in a flame or a colour, a moon or a star and for harmony in the shrill notes of a music which holds insects and animals, *e.g.* snakes and cows, spell-bound. The fact that some animals are attracted to light unconsciously and irresistibly, without being urged by any of their instincts, indicates that light has a crude and imperfect resemblance to consciousness.

In spite of this, the automatism of instincts is relaxed in man so suddenly and the difference between man and the highest and the most developed animal becomes so radical that we cannot help the conclusion that it is not a difference of degree but a difference of kind.

If the push of the urge of consciousness had not existed sub-consciously even in the meanest animal, no fresh de-

velopment of the nervous system or the brain and no fresh tendencies in the form of instincts could have come into existence as a result of the animal's effort. Fresh tendencies continued to appear in the animal in the course of evolution because the urge of consciousness in him was ever pressing for expression. Consciousness could neither continue its progress nor achieve its freedom without developing the instincts. What gave rise to the instincts was that the obstruction of matter, in a way, took its toll of a part of the freedom of consciousness in advance and the tendencies present latently in consciousness became tagged on to the animal brain and got fixed and rooted in it in the course of time, owing to the push of the vital force. Consciousness, so to say, sacrificed a portion of its freedom in order to make a passage for itself. The gradual multiplication of instincts in the course of evolution organized and developed the brain and thereby enabled consciousness to obtain its freedom.

Consciousness could not be free unless the brain permitted a free play for all the tendencies present in its nature. Consciousness could be free only when it could function fully and freely as a whole, that is, when the development of the brain could enable it to function in this way. But consciousness is not the sum total of instincts, nor is it the equivalent of the brain or its activity. It is not possible to add up the instincts to each other. Each instinct has its own independent urge and objective and responds to a definite situation or stimulus. The activity of each instinct is limited by the need of the body, *i.e.*, of the life of the organism. When an instinctive impulse is aroused, it is capable of being completely satisfied: the activity caused by each instinctive impulse comes to a point—the point of satiety—beyond which it cannot continue. Instinct expresses itself in automatic action while consciousness expresses itself in free action.

Consciousness is not the sum total of instincts also because it can oppose them all, rule them and fix the limits

of their satisfaction. The urge of consciousness is satisfied for its own sake while the urge of instinct has for its purpose the preservation of life. There is no doubt an area in the human brain corresponding to every instinct which serves as the physiological mechanism of the instinct but, while the sum total of all these areas may form the human brain, the sum total of instincts does not form the human consciousness.

There is no parallelism between the brain and consciousness as a Cartesian philosopher would have us believe. Dual personality, sub-conscious mind and memory are mental phenomena which cannot be explained on the parallelism hypothesis. Consciousness must be regarded as a stream or a current and the brain as the opening through which this stream is flowing. We cannot identify the opening with the current although the opening and the current must be closely connected with each other, so that the flow of the current is sure to be retarded if the opening is not wide enough. The slightest injury to the cereberum upsets the functions of self, of consciousness, not because consciousness is the equivalent of the brain but because the current is unable to flow as a whole; it is retarded and interfered with, because the opening has become narrower. The imbecile or the idiot is unable to give a full expression to the urge of his consciousness because of the undeveloped condition of his brain.

Consciousness is not the equivalent of the brain just as a stream is not the equivalent of the opening through which it has been allowed to flow. The contents of the stream are independent of the opening which only permits them a passage. In fact, in this case, the stream which is consciousness is not only independent of the opening which is the brain but the opening has been itself bored by the stream in its effort to find an outlet by a gradual process which continued till the opening was wide enough to let it through. It is this process, known as the evolution of species, by which the animal brain continued to evolve

till consciousness secured for itself a full passage, which we understand as the human brain.

As all instincts are carved out of consciousness and the tendencies involved in the instincts are similar to the tendencies of consciousness itself, it has misled many psychologists and philosophers into the error of regarding one instinct or the other or all instincts as the urge of human life. Marx regards the instinct of feeding as the life dynamic. According to Freud the sex instinct and according to Adler the instinct of self-assertion is the cause of all human activities. McDougall holds the view that all instincts together constitute the urge of human life. But the facts of human nature make it clear that far from the instincts being the urge of life they are themselves ruled and controlled by the urge of life which is the urge of consciousness. To sum up, on the view maintained in this book, there are a number of human activities—the most important of them all, by the way—which are not due to the urge of our psycho-physical dispositions but are directly caused by the urge of self-consciousness which is the special privilege of man. The psycho-physical dispositions respond to external situations or stimuli automatically but the urge of self-consciousness, which takes the form of an urge for an ideal, is so powerful that it can control and check this response. It can obstruct or reduce the activity of the cerebral mechanism of the instinct and stop or limit the flow of its psychological channel for its own satisfaction. There is no specially located physiological mechanism in the brain corresponding to this urge and, if it has got any physiological instrument, it is the human brain as a whole which itself has been evolved on account of the pressure of this urge ever trying to come to the forefront in the animal stage of evolution.

In whatever direction and number the instincts developed they always centered themselves around one purpose—that of the preservation of life in the individual as well as the race of species. Consequently, the instincts

determine the organism to repel, or be repelled by, those objects that are unfavourable to it and attract, or be attracted towards, those objects that are favourable to it. All instincts (and for this purpose we may impart the term a meaning wide enough to include also what McDougall denotes as innate tendencies) can, therefore, be divided into two main classes.

Firstly, those instincts which induce the animal to repel, or be repelled by, unfavourable objects. These are for example, the instinct of Flight and Concealment with the attending emotion of fear and the instinct of Repulsion with the accompanying emotion of disgust and the instinct of Pugnacity with its emotion of anger. These instincts may be called *the instincts of repulsion.*

Secondly, those instincts and innate tendencies that cause the animal to attract, or be attracted by, objects that are favourable to it. Among these may be mentioned the Parental, the Gregarious and the Sex instincts and the instincts of Curiosity, Feeding, Self-assertion and Self-abasement and the innate tendencies of Construction, Acquisition, Sympathy, Sympathetic Induction, Suggestion, Suggestibility and Imitation. These instincts and innate tendencies may be classed as *the instincts of attraction.*

Play is the mock activity of consciousness as a whole and therefore involves both attraction and repulsion. It exercises all the instincts possessed by the animal whether they are the instincts of attraction or the instincts of repulsion.

If we grant that no tendency could make its appearance in the animal which was not present latently in consciousness and that instincts are merely tendencies within consciousness that became attached to matter, that is, to the brain of the organism, in order to determine it to act automatically for the protection of its life and race, then it becomes evident, even from a study of animal instincts, that the principal function of consciousness or its central tendency must be Love, which, of course, also includes Hatred. Hatred is not a tendency apart from or opposed to love.

It is an attitude which results from love; it is simply a reaction of love and always sub-serves the love that is the cause of it. Nobody can ever love anything without hating something else in the very interest of his love. Hatred is, therefore, a counterpart of love; it forms a natural indispensable complement of love.

As the instincts in which consciousness expressed itself in the animal stage became split up into two categories the instincts of attraction and the instincts of repulsion, attraction and repulsion must be the basic attributes of consciousness. One could have easily expected even before man appeared on this earth that as soon as consciousness became free (as it has become free in man) it would exhibit these every tendencies of attraction and repulsion as the characteristics of its nature and such is actually the case. Attraction and repulsion are the fundamental characteristics of free consciousness in the human being. Just as fixed consciousness in the form of instincts felt a repulsion from everything opposed to the life of the organism and an attraction for every thing that favoured it, so free consciousness in man feels an attraction for the ideal and everything that favours the ideal and a repulsion from every thing that is opposed to the ideal.

All those tendencies which consciousness expressed in the form of instincts have taken a second birth or rather found their liberty in free consciousness. We find that, when a man loves an ideal, there are occasions when on account of the single influence of his love for it he has a reason to feel angry, to fear, to be disgusted, to feel tender emotion, curiosity, self-assertion, self-abasement and so on. He constructs, acquires, imitates, sympathises and indulges in other activities, similar to those compelled by his instinctive tendencies, freely in the service of his ideal. But naturally because consciousness becomes free in man, it must express in him many more tendencies than those which it needed to express at the animal stage in the form of instincts; it must express in him all the tendencies present in its nature

and not a few that were necessary for the animal for the continuation of his life and race. This explains why the emotional reaction of man to external events is far more varied and complicated than that of the animal. While the loves and hatreds entering into the functions of the instincts are fixed loves and fixed hatreds and their object is simply the maintenance and the growth of the organism, the love and hatred of free consciousness must be free love and free hatred—the result of voluntary choice—and its object must be the maintenance and the growth of consciousness itself.

Love manifests itself as the principal tendency or the central attribute of consciousness not only at the human or the animal stage but also at the material stage of life. Like the instincts of the animal, the laws of matter too can be divided into two classes, the laws of attraction and the laws of repulsion. The attraction and repulsion of the animal, that is the instincts, resemble the attraction and repulsion of matter which take the form of the physical laws.

Let us now examine further the nature of the urge of consciousness.

That man is a self-conscious animal creates a great difference between him and the lower animals. Immediately as consciousness becomes conscious of itself, it becomes conscious of its own incompleteness; it becomes conscious of something that it has lost. It feels a strong pull of attraction for something unknown. It feels that it is missing something that was a part of itself. It therefore wants to be itself, to regain itself and to come into its own by reaching that missing object. It feels lonely and incomplete without it and therefore begins to seek it at once. It is inwardly convinced that the object of its desire is something great, beautiful and worthy of every love and sacrifice; yet it does not know exactly what it is. It therefore takes sometimes one object and at other times another object for what is missed but finds frequently that it is mis-

taken. Each time that it mistakes an object for the object of its desire it bestows upon it the whole of that love and devotion of which it is capable and continues to do so as long as the error is not discovered. When the error is discovered, it turns its love to a new object. Although consciousness does not understand correctly the object of its desire, yet all the time that it is seeking this object, it is really feeling a desire for itself, for its source from which it has got separated, that is, for the Consciousness of the Universe. It is feeling the pressure of the urge of love for the World-Self.

The conclusion follows from the very definition of the term love. Love is the lover's desire for completeness by means of something which is or which appears to him to be apart from himself and yet is a part of himself. If it is a fact that consciousness loves, then it can love only consciousness and nothing else. The real can be completed only by the real and, it can, therefore, love only the real. The unreal cannot complete the real and it, therefore, fails to satisfy the love of the real. In fact since nothing else besides consciousness is real, nothing else besides consciousness is there to be loved. The unreal is non-existent.

If the human consciousness loves anything different from the Consciousness of the World, how is it that its yearning and its desire for love persists even after it has achieved the object of its best desire at any time? A man may love position, power, riches, fame, wife or children but even when he has had a share of all these cherished objects to his heart's desire, he still remains unsatisfied. The standard of the object of his desire continues to rise higher and higher always. When his highest desire is achieved, he finds that there is still a large surplus of unsatisfied desire in him. He even feels that he is as unhappy as he ever was. Why so? His love is evidently for something of unlimited excellence and this can be no other than the Consciousness of the World itself.

All the loves of man, except his love for consciousness, are either fixed loves of the instincts—those affinities of his

animal nature, similar to the affinities of matter, which satisfy the body but leave the consciousness still thirsty—or else they are errors committed by his consciousness in the search for its desired object, errors which are bound to be realized and abandoned sooner or later. In both cases these loves are unstable and unsatisfactory. In the whole of this Universe everything else besides consciousness is created by consciousness and belongs to one of the stages of evolution which consciousness has outgrown and left behind as conquered obstacles. How can it bring itself to love one of these things except owing to an error? None of these things can be the goal of consciousness because its goal must lie ahead of it and not behind it.

The sub-conscious attraction of human consciousness for the Universal Consciousness may be compared to the attraction between the opposite poles of two magnets or the opposite charges of electricity. This attraction manifests itself on the human side in various forms but the principal form of it is the urge for ideals. It is this attraction that we have described as the urge of consciousness or the urge of self.

We may now consider some of the conclusions necessitated by the hypothesis put forth above. Since the human self loves only consciousness, it follows that consciousness alone is beauty. It is the safest and the most comprehensive definition of beauty to say that beauty is that something which the human self loves. In this definition the word self is important, for we have seen that the human self is consciousness in freedom and is distinct from the human instincts and that the human instincts are also characterized by a sort of love, forced and automatic, which is common to the animal and the human being and which has for its purpose the maintenance of life. A sharp distinction must, therefore, be made between the object of love of the human self and the object or objects of love of the human instincts. Beauty is the object of love of the human self and not that of the love of any of the human instincts.

A mother may love her child compelled by the maternal instinct, although the child may be devoid of all moral or physical beauty from the point of view of other persons. A prostitute may look beautiful to an immoral youngman on account of the force of his sex instinct. Her beauty is, however, marred in the eye of a man who has learnt to discover beauty in morality or goodness.

Indeed, the urge of self and the urge of the instinct get mixed up in the human being in such a way that it is often difficult to tell what part of a person's love for an object or idea is due to the urge of self or what part of it is due to the urge of the instinct. As hitherto the philosophers have made no sharp and accurate distinction between the urge of self and the urge of instinct, they have found it difficult to define exactly the nature of beauty. The appreciation and love of beauty is a function of free consciousness and not that of the instincts. The greater the freedom of consciousness the greater its capacity to know, appreciate and love beauty.

All the attributes of consciousness are lovable and beautiful and conversely all the attributes and qualities that we can love are ultimately the qualities of consciousness. Beauty belongs to nothing else except consciousness; it is, therefore, only another name for consciousness. Beauty in concrete objects is a reflection of the creating consciousness in all its qualities. Whenever we are admiring or loving an object, we are really admiring or loving consciousness. An object that appears beautiful to us does so because it conveys to us an impression of the qualities of consciousness in their harmonious combination, although we become aware of the presence of these qualities in such a combination only sub-consciously. No object can appear to us to be beautiful if the impression conveyed by it misses or exaggerates any one of the qualities of consciousness. The reason is that consciousness is a harmonious whole and none of its qualities can be removed or separated from it or added to it inconsistently with the rest of its qualities. What we

consider as ugly is, as a matter of fact, a mixture of the ugly and the beautiful; it contains some qualities of consciousness and lacks others; it is, therefore, on the whole unattractive.

All the qualities that we consider beautiful are ultimately abstract qualities which belong to consciousness. Plato righ ly said that the more abstract the beautiful the more beautiful it is. The reason for this is quite plain to see. A reflection, when it approaches the original, must needs become more and more perfect. Whenever we are loving a concrete object for its beauty, it is our love for consciousness and its abstract qualities that the object is stimulating and it is beautiful to the extent to which it is capable of stimulating this love and keeping up the stimulation. The more we are lost in the contemplation of these abstract qualities the more beautiful the object appears to us.

But although many objects in this world may be able to present an appearance of beauty and arouse our love, yet, in spite of our wishes, nothing remains to us to be permanently lovable except consciousness. Nothing except consciousness can satisfy the whole of our desire for beauty. Nothing has the qualities of consciousness to a perfection except consciousness itself.

Whenever we love an object or an idea other than consciousness, whole-heartedly, we commit an error whereby we substitute the object or the idea for consciousness. The missing qualities of consciousness in such an object or idea are supplied for us unconsciously by our desire for beauty (which we call imagination) in order to complete the error. This error is nevertheless very sweet and consoling because, for the time being, it satisfies the desire of self which is always pressing for satisfaction. This error is also useful because it stimulates and gives expression to our desire for consciousness. It gives a spur to life and makes us act and exert ourselves. The error, in any case, brings us a bit nearer to consciousness and, when the painful disillusionment is reached, leaves us qualified for

a better and a more vigorous effort for our real ideal on account of our familiarity with the joy that attends such an effort. We are, by our nature, incapable of loving anything else besides consciousness, unless we attribute to that thing consciously or unconsciously the qualities of consciousness. Of course, the word 'we' in this context means our self-s and not our instincts, the man and not the animal in us. We should not confuse the love of self with the love of instincts, for the love of instincts has not the same result for us as the love of self. While the former leads to the fitness and the growth of the body, the latter conduces to the fitness and the growth of the self.

The concrete objects appear beautiful to us if and when they suggest the expression of consciousness in all its qualities. The essential characteristic of consciousness on account of which it gives expression to all its qualities is creative activity manifested in the form of a free movement towards an end, a purpose or an ideal. An object that is able to create a feeling of life, vigorous and powerful, growing and creating fully and freely, appears to us to be beautiful. Objects are beautiful to us when they are able to impart a feeling of growing and creating life.

It is not enough as an explanation of beauty to say, as Plato said, that beauty resides in order. Why order is beautiful? Order is the imprint of consciousness; it suggests consciousness at work, loving an ideal, approaching it, creating and evolving freely and thereby expressing all its qualities uniformly. There is beauty in harmony of colour, form, sound, word or movement because harmony too is an impression of the creative activity of consciousness. Harmony is the absence of conflict and therefore suggests a free and full expression of consciousness. There is beauty in simplicity because it is a kind of harmony and order.

It is possible to discover and feel a reflection of beauty in everything because everything is an expression and creation of consciousness but it depends upon the attitude of our mind, our knowledge and the strength of the urge of self

or the strength of our desire for beauty, which varies with different persons; it depends also on the training and the habits of the observing mind. There are some objects which reflect the expression of consciousness more easily than others. In them beauty is discovered without much imagination even by an ordinary man. It is such objects that are considered beautiful ordinarily. We lack the necessary knowledge and training to know and appreciate the beauty of many things. A poet discovers beauty in objects which appear to us to be ordinary and prosaic. The reason is that the poet's desire for beauty is stronger than ours and he is able to supply by his imagination the missing qualities of consciousness in the suggestion conveyed by such objects. That is why he is a poet. We often call a person a poet when he displays the capacity to feel the beauty of ordinary things, although he may have never expressed his poetry in verse. To a scientist an atom is a model of beauty because he sees in its structure an organization, an order and a harmony of which an ordinary man can have no idea. The beauty of a concrete object consists in its ability to suggest the expression or the creative activity of consciousness.

Everything is not able to suggest the expression of consciousness easily. A picture conveys to us the impression of beauty acquired by the mind of the artist who has made it. It suggests the expression of his consciousness and therefore looks beautiful. But the isolated part of a picture, when it is unable to suggest the whole picture, does not look beautiful ordinarily because it does not *suggest* the expression of consciousness, although it may be actually its expression. If, however, a person's imagination is able to supply the gaps and thereby reach the whole impression of the artist, he may be able to find a part of the picture as much an expression of consciousness and therefore as beautiful as the whole picture itself. This is what a poet does. This accounts for the apparently relative character of beauty. Beauty must vary with the ability of persons to discover it.

The whiteness of death and disease is similar to the whiteness of the skin of a beautiful young girl but the former does not appear to us to be beautiful because it is life and growth and not death and decay which can suggest the creative activity of consciousness. Whatever is able to convey a feeling of a creating consciousness is judged as beautiful and the opposite is condemned as ugly. The redness of a rose is similar to the redness of an inflammation but, while the former is beautiful, the latter is not. The reason is that the rose easily suggests a creating and evolving *i.e.* a loving consciousness on account of its association with freshness, growth and harmony, the qualities which an inflammation is lacking. When we see a rose, we feel unconsciously that it is the creation of the loving care of a consciousness and this is what makes it look beautiful. When nature appears to us in a form which we would have loved to impart to it ourselves and which therefore appears to us to have been imparted to it by a consciousness like our own, capable of loving and creating, we say that it is beautiful.

A thing is beautiful when it embodies the expression of the love of a consciousness. We cannot appraise anything as beautiful or love anything which does not appear to us to bear the imprint of love, the central attribute of consciousness. The individual who loves nature must feel that it has a form in which he would have himself loved to create it, a form which is the result of the love or the creative activity of a consciousness like his own. The appreciation of beauty is only another name for the conscious or unconscious presence of such a feeling. If we cannot actually create nature when it appears beautiful to us, the fact that we, at least, attempt to recreate it in the form of a painting on canvas or paper, when we have the ability to do so, is an evidence of the existence of this feeling.

Love, whether divine or human, takes the form of creation. Nobody ever loved who did not create and nobody ever created who did not love. It is in loving that

all the qualities of consciousness, Power, Goodness, Truth, Creativeness, etc., become manifest. Love alone is the full expression of consciousness and therefore love alone is the cause of beauty. We love whatever object appears to us to be the expression of the love of a consciousness because there it is that we are able to feel the presence of consciousness in all its qualities, that is, in their harmonious combination in which alone all of them can exist as each one including all. It only means that we can love nothing but consciousness and nothing but consciousness is beauty.

If the human consciousness did not feel a natural pull of attraction for the source of consciousness, the word beauty would have had no meaning for us. We feel the beauty of objects and ideas because we are capable of loving consciousness. It would not have been possible for us to discover beauty in anything if we had no desire for beauty and this desire is no other than our urge of love for consciousness.

The strength of the desire for beauty which seems to vary with different persons more or less in proportion to their intelligence has very much to do with the amount of beauty we attribute to objects we see. This desire is always insisting on expression and finds an outlet in whatever object it can. It lends charm to certain things with which it is thus able to form a habit of expression. It is because of this fact that a negro woman looks beautiful to the African black and the farmer finds his rustic surroundings as beautiful and attractive as the gay, decorated parks of a city appear to its inhabitants.

What kind of suggestion we shall be able to take from particular objects depends upon the way in which our internal desire for beauty has been guided by our environment, experience, training and habit. The age-long controversy whether beauty is subjective or objective is hardly necessary. Beauty is both subjective and objective. It is subjective because it belongs to consciousness and can be known by consciousness and it is objective in so far as

objects reflect or suggest consciousness.

The fact that the human consciousness loves only the Universal Consciousness leads us to the further conclusion that so far as man is concerned the word 'love' can be rightly used only when the love of consciousness is meant. Every other love must be a part of this love, must subserve this love or must be only an error waiting to be realized and corrected, thus making place for the right love. No other love can bring a permanent satisfaction to the self. We conclude also that the desire for consciousness or Beauty is the sole urge of human life. It is the Right, the Perfect or the True Ideal of man. It is the self's own ideal. When out of our love we are *discovering* beauty, we call it the *pursuit of science and knowledge.* When we are *expressing* beauty in colour, word, sound, brick, stone, voice or movement, we call it *art* in all its varieties. When we are *acting* beauty, we call it *morality*. None of these activities is due to instincts. They are some of the activities in which we express the urge of our consciousness. We indulge in them for their own sake and for the satisfaction that they bring us. In so far as these activities may have another aim besides themselves they are not the activities of consciousness on its own.

But the urge of consciousness for Beauty is not so weak as our fitful and leisurely expression in the above activities would suggest. These activities are by no means binding on us and we may indulge in them to a large extent at our own leisure or convenience. But the desire of human consciousness for its source, the Consciousness of the World, really takes the form of a very strong pull of attraction. It is a very powerful and compelling desire being the strongest desire that we have. It is this desire that has made man what he is. It is the cause of all our joys and sorrows and all our activities from one end of our life to the other. Its satisfaction causes ecstasies of joy and its disappointment produces shocks, nervous diseases and ailments. All the hustle and bustle in the world are due to it. The whole of

the history of the human race has been made by it.

The most important manifestation of this desire of consciousness is our attachment to ideals. We love ideals, act and strive for them, impelled by this desire. All the other activities of self in which we express our desire for beauty *i.e.*, worship, morality or the pursuit of art or science and knowledge, although indulged in for their own sake and for the satisfaction that they bring us, are ultimately subservient to the ideal. The ideal satisfies the whole of our desire for beauty and these activities, therefore, become a part of the ideal.

Lost in its material surroundings, the human consciousness is unable to know what exactly it wants, although it knows that it wants something extremely beautiful, great and good, capable of giving it perfect happiness and joy. Consciousness, therefore, chooses out of all objects that are known to it at a given time, an object that is most satisfactory to it and gives it the whole of its love, devotion and service. This object is its ideal. It is the self's substitute for the real object that it desires but cannot find.

The standard of beauty or the value of the ideal entertained by the self at a particular time depends upon the knowledge of the self at that time, because the self can do no more than choose the highest beauty and the most satisfactory object that is known to it at any time. The ideal may itself be very low in the scale of beauty but the self tries to imagine that it contains all the attributes of its desired object and when it cannot succeed in this effort, it is disappointed and immediately takes another object more satisfactory to it as its ideal. Naturally, as the circle of known objects and, ideas goes on extending, the self's ideal goes on rising in the scale of beauty because the self can make its choice out of an ever larger and larger number of such objects and ideas and it becomes possible for it to discover ever more and more beautiful and satisfactory objects or ideas to love. As an ideal evolves in this way it approaches in its qualities nearer and nearer to the Right

Ideal, which is what the self really desires.

At each stage of its knowledge the self loves its ideal for want of a better one and a still better one and not for its intrinsic beauty which remains imperfect as long as the self does not reach the Right Ideal. But as long as the self loves an ideal it remains oblivious of the elements of imperfection that it contains and ascribes to it for the time being, of course wrongly, all the beauty that it desires. The reason is that it cannot wait for better knowledge. It must satisfy its urge for an ideal with whatever object or idea it can. That is why it is painful to a person to hear anything in condemnation of his ideal. His nature compels him to imagine that it contains all the beauty that he desires, that it possesses all the attributes of consciousness in their perfection. We have known that nothing is ever beautiful or lovable to us which does not appear to reflect all the qualities of consciousness and we believe, though unconsciously sometimes, that the ideal, the most beautiful object or idea with us, is not merely an image of the qualities of consciousness but their sole possessor.

It is impossible for us to check or hold in abeyance safely any one of our impulses for a single moment unless we do so for the sake of a stronger impulse. If a hungry man cannot eat, he must act with a view to reach food; if he cannot act, he must think of food. The impulse to eat finds an expression in acting or thinking. The impulse to love an ideal is similarly irresistible. A man who is disappointed with his ideal but cannot find a better one tries to create an ideal in his imagination and love it. This leads to reveries and day dreams which pave the way for shocks and nervous breakdowns. The urge of consciousness must find an outlet with some object or another and the self, therefore, attaches itself to something or another always. As soon as a higher beauty comes to its knowledge, the self begins to consider inferior and unworthy of its love the idea which it is loving already and then this idea is abandoned entirely or retained to the extent to

which it serves the higher beauty upon which consciousness now bestows the whole of its love.

We may, therefore, define an ideal as that object or idea to which the self ascribes the highest beauty and excellence known to it at any time and to which, therefore, it attaches itself whole-heartedly. The knowledge implied in the word 'known' used in this connection must be understood as a feeling and not as an intellectual knowledge of logically demonstrated propositions or merely a piece of information stored in memory. Beauty can be known only when it is felt. It is quite possible that we may generally remember as beauty one thing, say on the authority of another person, and feel as beauty something else. We know something as beauty only when we feel it as beauty.

Ideals evolve in the life of the individual as well as in the life of the race. In the life of the individual they grow from childhood onwards. To the child the most satisfactory objects are those that satisfy his instinctive desires *e.g.* delicious eatables. Hence the urge of his consciousness finds an outlet in the attraction he feels for such objects. Later on, as he grows in years, he comes to have an admiration for his elders, parents and teachers. They impress him on account of their superiority in all matters. He seeks their approbation, which becomes his ideal. In order to win it he is prepared to regulate as much as possible his conduct and control his instinctive desires, which once formed his ideal. If he is able to win it, he feels happy; if not, he feels unhappy. When his knowledge and intellectual powers develop further, his standard of beauty undergoes further improvement. He is able to compare his ideals which are many in the beginning and choose one that is most satisfactory. Ultimately, the self is incapable of loving more than one ideal at a time because it knows subconsciously that the object of its real desire is only one. Jesus, the Christ, pronounced a great truth of human nature when he said that no man can serve two masters at the same time.

The ideal is the goal of self, the final end of all its actions. As long as a particular object or idea remains the ideal of the self, the self loves it, lives for it and tries to achieve it in all possible ways. It loves the ideal and loves all those objects that help its achievement and realization. At the same time it hates all those objects which interfere with its love and wants to get rid of them. Hate and love as functions of consciousness thus go hand in hand for the protection and evolution of consciousness.

The self can make its way to the object of the highest beauty known to it, that is, to its ideal, only by a series of actions performed one after the other. Each of these actions has a goal or an end of its own, but all these minor ends or goals subserve the final end which alone is the ruling end. The subordinate ends are innumerable but the ruling end is only one and this alone deserves to be called the ideal.

The subordinate ends have no independent existence of their own since they are determined and created by the ideal. A grown up educated man who thinks he has two ideals at the same time, for example, his religion and his country, does not really know what his ideal is; he has had no chance of knowing it. His illusion is due to a lack of self-examination. As a matter of fact one of his professed ideals is sub-ordinate to the other. If he lives long enough, a situation must arise in which his two ideals will come into a clear clash with each other and then one of them will be discovered to be ruling the other.

It is not possible for an Englishman to be a true Christian and a true Nationalist at one and the same time, nor is it possible for a German to be a true Nazi and a true Christian simultaneously. Every religion is an ideal by itself. If Christianity is an ideal, Nationalism too is an ideal. No two ideals or ideologies can be perfectly compatible with each other, unless they are identical in which case they cannot have two names, or unless one becomes subordinate to the other, in which case again only one

remains. A person may no doubt find it expedient to conceal his views sometimes and may conceal them without knowing that he is doing so but that does not mean that he has two ideals. The ideal which actually determines the actions of a man is only one because the self is incapable of having more than one ideal at the same time as a result of conscious choice.

A person who thinks he loves no particular ideal or loves many ideals at the same time may be asked to give up, one by one, all objects, or ideas that he loves, in such a way that the object or the ideal that he loves the least may be the first to be abandoned every time. This process must bring him ultimately to one object or idea that he will not be prepared to forsake at any cost because he happens to feel that it is an indispensable part of himself. This object or idea is his ideal and the love of it is really influencing all his actions, whether he is aware of it or not. The love of all other objects or ideas that he is prepared to abandon is subservient to his love for this object or idea and is regulated and controlled by it.

An ideal takes many forms. It may be one of our instinctive desires, *e.g.*, eating, drinking or sexual pleasures. It may be a son, a wife, a friend, a boss, riches, fame, honour, property, profession, position, power or title. It may be narrowly altruistic *e.g.*, the love of a tribe, a caste, a guild, a community, a race, a colour, or a nation. It may be of the nature of an ideology *e.g.*, Christianity, Democracy, Nationalism, Humanism, Socialism, Naziism or Communism. When a person comes to love the Right Ideal all his other loves either disappear, in case they are entirely incompatible with the Right Ideal, or else, assume their proper proportions. He knows upto what extent he should love his son, his wife, his friend, his boss, his house or his profession or how far he should care for money, position or power. He knows the correct importance of race, colour, caste, creed, community or nation. He understands the real meaning of Democracy, Humanism and Altruism

and also the points of weakness and strength in Socialism, Communism and Fascism. The Right Ideal lifts him to a "Belvedere of common-sense" in the words of Stevenson, where he can see every object and idea in its true perspective.

The nearer a person's ideal is to the Right Ideal and its qualities the higher we judge his culture to be, although it is rarely that we understand in what exactly does that high culture, which we attribute to him, consist. The qualities of a person's ideal can be judged only by the actions which it induces and not by a verbal profession of this ideal or that. An ideal is a felt beauty. It is not a theory but an urge for action; it is something which is actually determining or causing all the actions of a person; it is a personal intimate desire of his which is really dominating him in all his activities. We may say to a person whatever we like, reason or argue with him, but his ideal holds him in such a thrall that he follows only his ideal and nothing else. He will modify his behaviour only when the ideal is modified and this depends not on our arguments and reasons but on his feeling a greater beauty else-where. He is helpless before the law of his nature which requires that all his activities be controlled by his ideal.

Some of our activities—those meant to sustain the body and continue the race—have no doubt their origin in the instincts but we must not forget that the urge for the ideal controls all these activities, specifies the manner in which we should indulge in them and determines the limits upto which they should be carried on, very strictly. It is but the ideal, therefore, that is the controlling force of our activities and the urge of our life. That these activities have their origin in the instincts which function automatically is only an important side-help to the urge of consciousness which (since the body is required by it) would have looked to the duties performed by the instincts in their absence but which is now mostly free to look to itself and to interfere or not to interfere with the instincts to the extent to

which it is essential for its own satisfaction and expression. The instincts and their desires meet the urge of consciousness half-way in its efforts to satisfy itself but do not control the life of the individual which is the privilege of the urge of consciousness alone.

As an animal, man has to satisfy his urge of instincts and as a self-conscious being he has to satisfy his urge of consciousness. The lower urge subserves and is sacrificed for the satisfaction of the higher one. All the activities of man which are due to the instincts are also due to the urge of consciousness more or less either because the urge of consciousness is finding expression through one or more of the instinctive desires mistaking them for the ideal or because it is interfering with them or not interfering with them for the sake of an ideal which happens to be different from the instinctive desires. When one of the instinctive desires is itself the ideal, its force is enhanced immensely. In such a case, since the desire of consciousness and the desire of the instinct reinforce each other and move the self in the same direction, the strength of the instinctive desire is equal to the sum of two forces—the force of the urge of the instinct and the force of the urge of self.

A catch-phrase that the urge of hunger is the strongest urge in man has gained much currency now-a-days on account of the spread of Communist ideas. But hunger is not the strongest urge in man by itself. It becomes strong only when it is supported by the urge of consciousness or the urge for the ideal, that is, when the ideal says to a person, "You must live first of all". In that case, attending to the business of living is one of the subordinate goals or ends of the self to which a reference has been made above. It is a means to an end and the end is the ideal. But when the ideal says "You must die first of all," we come to know which is the stronger impulse, the urge for the ideal or the urge for hunger. The willingness with which the Communists of Russia received German bullets on their chests in the last world-war is a proof that the impulse for the ideal

is not only stronger than hunger but is also stronger than all the impulses in man the object of which is the preservation of life. Sometimes it may appear to us that in a particular individual the impulse for the ideal is weaker than an instinctive impulse, for example, when a soldier runs away from the battlefield to save his life. But the soldier will do so only when the ideal of which the beauty he feels is not the ideal of the politician who has commanded him to fight but some other object or idea *e.g.*, to live and enjoy life. You can know a man's ideal only from his actions and in no other way.

Similarly, a Freudian will say that sex is the strongest impulse in man. As a matter of fact, the sex impulse is strong only when the impulse for the ideal is erroneously having its expression in the sex love (see chapter VII). When this is not the case, a man would care more for his ideal than for his sex desire. Sometimes a man may not marry at all and may have nothing to do with women throughout his life in spite of normal health and may devote his life to religion or social service. Some psychologists call it sublimation and wrongly explain it as the diversion of the energy of the sex instinct into channels of higher desires. Why are some desires higher than others, if, as these psychologists maintain, every desire is due to one instinct or another? Really, it is a case of the urge of consciousness, that is to say, the urge for ideals, dominating the sex desire and holding it in check by asserting itself. No diversion of energy has taken place. The hypothesis of diversion is based on the idea that we have no independent, natural desires of a higher order. The energy of an instinct cannot be diverted safely into other channels. It is fixed and rooted to its own normal course, along which alone it can have a normal expression. It has only one natural passage through which it can flow and that is marked out in the activity of the creature leading to the natural satisfaction of the instinct. We cannot check an instinctive desire completely unless we do so for the satisfaction of

a strong desire for the ideal, which satisfaction becomes a substitute for the abandoned satisfaction of the instinctive desire, for reasons which will be discussed later. This kind of check on the instinctive desire is natural and harmless. When, however, we check it in an unnatural manner, that is, when no satisfaction of the urge for the ideal is intended thereby, we compel it to have an abnormal expression: we pervert it and the result is a mental derangement. The impulse of an instinct can be weakened by strengthening the impulse for the ideal. What has happened in the case of a person who has "sublimated" his sex desire is this: The impulse for the ideal has refused to support the sex instinct and has decided to have its own way and it has also found that it can have its own way and satisfy itself to the fullest extent only by avoiding marriage. As the urge for the ideal has gained in strength and has captured the love of the self increasingly by finding a greater and greater expression in its own activities, the urge of sex has become weaker and weaker by disuse and by getting less and less expression. When the urge of consciousness gets its full expression, it becomes so powerful that the self is enabled to dominate the instinctive desires very easily, because a very small part of love at the disposal of self remains for the instinctive desires to make use of (see chapter VII).

Sometimes we indulge in activities which are to all appearances contrary to the requirements of the ideal professed by us. These too are the result of some ideal of the past. They are due to the force of habits contracted under the influence of a previous ideal and which are having their way because new habits consistent with the new ideal have not yet developed. Or else, they are due to a weak love for the new ideal, so that other ideals can still claim a greater portion of the love of self sometimes. The ideal is not attracting the love of the self continuously and changes places with other ideals occasionally. The self cannot keep it in the focus of attention. Its beauty fluctuates like the flickering flame of a candle exposed to the wind.

The new ideal needs protection from the chance winds of inconsistent habits and ideals. This protection is afforded by suitable education and environment.

Just as the ideal evolves in the case of the individual ultimately approaching in its qualities more and more the Right Ideal, similarly the ideals have advanced and will continue to advance in the history of the race too in the direction of the Right Ideal. So far the ideals of society have evolved somewhat in the following order; the Family, the Tribe, the King, the Nation, Democracy, Communism, etc.

The change from one ideal to another is due to a dissatisfaction with the ideal and the dissatisfaction is caused by the nature of the self's desire which is an urge for the Right Ideal and cannot be satisfied by anything except the Right Ideal. Each ideal that the self entertains is taken by it, for the time being, as perfectly satisfactory to it. Intimacy with the ideal discloses its shortcomings in the course of time. When the self is disillusioned, it adopts another ideal which is free from the defects of the previous one but which, unless it is the Right Ideal, contains some other defects. History is to the human society what memory is to the human individual. By experience conserved in history mankind is becoming ever more and more familiar with the qualities of the Perfect Ideal. The criterion within our nature is always operating.

We can know by experience what ideal is unsatisfactory but it is difficult to know what ideal will prove perfectly satisfactory to us. As our ideal evolves in Beauty, we know our inner desire or criterion more and more, that is, we know ourselves more and more, we become more and more self-conscious. When we are disappointed with an ideal because of its defects, we may not know what exactly we want but we try to avoid, in the next choice, the mistakes we have already committed. Consciousness is always pressing forward in search of Perfect Beauty—the object of its

desire. It goes on taking in its ignorance now one thing and now another for its beloved. Each time it chooses for its ideal an object or an idea which has the greatest resemblance with consciousness to the best of its knowledge. Although the resemblance is partial, it is unable to see this fact and clings to it with a fervour of love which it would feel for consciousness itself but only to be disillusioned after sometime. Then it feels disappointed, miserable and shocked and seeks another ideal at once. It does not tire and does not stop because it cannot stop. If it cannot love one thing, it must love something else immediately because it must love some thing always—such is the urge of its nature.

Loving or seeking is a function of consciousness which consciousness must perform unceasingly. Since it is a function of all consciousness, it is common to the World-Consciousness and the human consciousness. The World-Self and the human-self are both loving and seeking each other in such a way that it is difficult to tell who is seeking the other. Consciousness is, therefore, both Beauty and Love on either side. It is Love when it is seeking consciousness and it is Beauty when it is being sought by consciousness. Love and Beauty are only two aspects of one and the same thing, consciousness, wherever it may be. When consciousness is being attracted by consciousness, it is Love and, when it is attracting it, it is Beauty and consciousness is always attracting consciousness as well as being attracted by it. Creation and the whole course of evolution of the past and future, if it means anything, it means that the Universal Consciousness has been attracting and seeking the human consciousness in the past and will continue to attract it and seek it in future and that the human consciousness in its potential form was seeking the Universal Consciousness in the past and will continue to seek it in future.

The human self is no doubt beauty but this beauty exists potentially, waiting to be revealed and unfolded. Man has got to discover it, unfold it and display it. The

gradual unfolding of the beauty of the human self is only the gradual realization of the Universal Consciousness in man and it will come as an inevitable result of the process of loving and seeking which continues on both sides of consciousness and which we understand as the course of history or the process of evolution.

The miracle will be wrought by love, that is, by man expressing the urge of his consciousness for Beauty. He is seeking Beauty in order to become Beauty himself. To love Beauty is to be one with Beauty and to be Beauty itself. Perfect satisfaction and happiness will come to man only when he has successfully achieved this identity as much as it lies in his nature to achieve it in this life. His nature compels him to seek this happiness and he cannot rest unless he has achieved it.

Of all ideals that the self may choose from time to time the self's own ideal, the Right Ideal, of which the attributes we shall study in a greater detail later on in this book, alone is capable of giving it an enduring and perfect happiness and completeness. Every other ideal is an error committed by the self in its search for its own ideal or its own happiness and completeness. When the self chooses a wrong ideal, it does so because of its illusion that it will lead to its greatest happiness and satisfaction. It is an idea which appears to it to embody the highest possible beauty and excellence. But since it can, by its very nature, love only the Universal Consciousness, it is forced to ascribe to the mistaken idea, quite unknowingly, all the qualities of the Right Ideal. It takes the idea for Reality itself. It becomes conscious of the presence, or rather the reflection, of certain qualities of consciousness in the idea and then it is misled into thinking that it must have the other qualities of consciousness as well; it, therefore, attributes these other qualities to the idea unconsciously in order to complete its error. As a matter of fact, no wrong ideal has any of the qualities of consciousness in it. When the self realizes that its ideal really lacks the qualities which it was attributing to it

unconsciously, it becomes immediately conscious that it has none of the qualities of the Right Ideal or, which is the same thing, the qualities of the Right Ideal that it appears to have become meaningless in the absence of the remaining qualities. That is the reason why the self abandons the ideal *wholly*. Every quality of consciousness, if it is genuine and worthy of itself, must include all its other qualities. An object or idea that really possesses one quality of the Right Ideal must possess all its other qualities, otherwise that one quality too is an illusion.

The self deceives itself with a wrong ideal as long as it can but it cannot do so for long. The unreal or the partially real cannot behave like the real and, therefore, in the life of the race, if not in the life of the individual, the wrong ideal reveals the presence of its own contradiction within itself. As the self's knowledge or its intimacy with the ideal grows, it comes to know the elements of untruth or the causes of dissatisfaction that lay concealed in it and it is, therefore, compelled to seek another ideal which is again completely mistaken for the Right Ideal. If the second choice is also wrong like the first one, it leads again to the ultimate, dissatisfaction and disillusionment of the self. Sometimes the race, in which of course the knowledge of self, whatever the stage it may have reached, continues to live for a long time may take centuries to discover the shortcomings of a wrong ideal. But the final disillusionment is inevitable, since the self's desire for Beauty or Reality is a criterion which never fails in the long run. The unreal is never entirely unreal. It is rather invariaby a combination of the real and the unreal. The unreal has innumerable varieties but the real is only one. A mixture of the real and the unreal cannot be real. The real is absolutely pure and free from all traces of the unreal. The unreal elements in a wrong ideal begin to take effect as the self develops intimacy with the ideal till at last they bring about the self's dissatisfaction with the ideal. The change from one ideal to another has made the history

of our race. Whenever we become dissatisfied with a wrong ideal, we are at once in a position to see a new glimpse of the real. Then we rush forward to it with a tremendous force as if this was all that we had wanted. This accounts for social upheavals and revolutions. No fresh light is possible unless we are dissatisfied with the existing ideal. A new ideal, however beautiful it may be, has no effect on the self, unless the self is available to love it or see its beauty and it can be available to love and see the beauty of the new ideal only when it is first dissatisfied with the old ideal. The extension of the self's knowledge and its introduction to new ideas (one of which may become its future ideal) no doubt hastens this dissatisfaction but the fact remains that the negation of the existing ideal is essential for the affirmation of the next. The Communist revolution of Russia would have been impossible without a general dissatisfaction with church, religion and capitalism.

It is important to note that dissatisfaction with ideals, revolutions and changes to new ideals are not really due to external events. The outside happenings add to the self's knowledge enabling it to see where beauty lies but dissatisfaction with one ideal and the choice of another is due to that norm or standard which the self carries in its nature. The external events, no doubt, appear to have caused our dissatisfaction but these events can have no meaning unless a meaning is given to them by our consciousness and our consciousness gives them a meaning only because it has a definite desire which craves for satisfaction. The real cause of all revolutions and changes of the political structure of societies lies deep down in our nature and that cause is the self's desire for beauty.

Every time that we choose a new wrong ideal we feel perfectly satisfied with it for some time. Our hopes are high. But soon the new ideal turns out to be a mistake no smaller than the previous one; because, while it incorporates into itself an aspect of the True Ideal which was long neglected and the neglect of which had caused our

dissatisfaction, it ignores some other important aspects of it and thus carries in itself the seeds of its own contradiction as well as of our future dissatisfaction. In due course of time, when the elements of the real lacking in the new ideal begin to tell upon the satisfaction of the self again, it seeks a new ideal in which the mistakes of the past are again avoided. Thus in the absence of our knowledge of what we really want, we please ourselves with substitutes which reveal their unsatisfactory nature in the course of time. Every time that we choose a new ideal, we, no doubt, avoid the mistakes of the past but we make fresh mistakes which necessitate a change again. This must continue till we reach the Right Ideal.

Supposing the Right Ideal, which is the real internal demand of the self, has elements or qualities which can be represented by the first 7 letters of the alphabet, a b c d e f g. Then, since the self is unable to see all these elements in anything that is known to it and since there is no object or idea in this world which has absolutely no quality bearing resemblance to the real, let us suppose that the self takes for its ideal an object which has only the element "a" in common with the Right Ideal. Then it will erroneously and unconsciously ascribe to it the six missing elements, so that we may represent the ideal by a b_1 c_1 d_1 e_1 f_1 g_1. But the substituted elements will gradually reveal their unreal character and a dissatisfaction will ensue. The self will come to know that it has absolutely nothing in common with the Right Ideal. It will, therefore, abandon that object *wholly* and take to another object which may now be represented by a b c d_2 e_2 f_2 g_2. Since the last four elements in this ideal are unreal, it will also bring about the self's dissatisfaction ultimately. The next ideal may be a b c d e f_3 g_3. It will be a very near approach to the Right Ideal but the elements f_3 g_3 will create a dissatisfaction with it too in the long run. Therefore *the whole* of it will have to be abandoned and we may take to another ideal to be represented by a b_4 c_4 d_4 e_4 f_4 g. This ideal is an improvement on the

previous ideal in some respects but a deterioration in some other respects. We have abandoned some of the real elements contained in the previous ideal on account of our dissatisfaction with it *as a whole.* Nothing is stable and permanently satisfactory and acceptable to the self unless it is totally good, however good it may be in many things. Although we cannot say that the last ideal chosen by us is always better than the previous one or the best of all those preceding it, yet on the whole we continue our progress towards an ideal of total beauty by a process of trial and error. In the last ideal the five elements from b to f will reveal their unreal nature in the course of time and we may have another ideal expressed by a_5 b_5 c d e f g_5 and so on.

It is evident that in this way the experience of our race conserved in History must bring us ultimately to the Right Ideal, for History is the memory of the human society. The process is very long and dangerous indeed. It is long because innumerable combinations of the real and unreal are possible. It is dangerous because every change to a new ideal requires a painful adjustment which may also prove to be futile since the ideal necessitating it, being false, may have to change itself. It is dangerous also because in the absence of the knowledge of the Right Ideal each section of humanity will have its own ideal and, when many ideals exist side by side, there must be strife, war and bloodshed. The Right Ideal is the only refuge of mankind from these dangers. It would appear as if the wrong ideals represented by the letters of alphabet above have *really* some elements or qualities in common with each other and with the Right Ideal. But as a matter of fact no wrong ideal has any element or quality in common with the Right Ideal. The apparently common elements of these ideals are never identical with each other. The character of each of these elements or qualities is influenced and altered by the rest of the ideal in every case so that it becomes different for every ideal. No quality of the Right Ideal is ever in its own unless it is a part of the Right Ideal

itself. Therefore an ideal is either totally right or it is totally wrong. *It follows that there can be no real or permanent basis for even a partial unity among different ideals and ideologies.*

Even religion is not an ideal of total beauty unless it is rightly understood. Whenever it contains an admixture of unreal elements, it fails to satisfy the urge of self. It is then similar to the ideal represented by the letters a b c d e f_3, g_3, above. The present hatred for religion in the West is due to the fact that religion had itself deteriorated into a wrong ideal in the course of time or to the fact that it was unable to meet all the requirements of our nature. On account of this it had to be abandoned totally. The Right Ideal is perfectly true to our nature. It gives us, therefore, an unlimited scope for progress of all kinds. It satisfies all our needs, social or political, and provides for the satisfaction of all our desires, mental, moral or physical, harmoniously and to the fullest extent. It neglects and suppresses nothing that is in our nature. It gives us a perfect and permanent happiness and, whenever it fails to do so, it is no longer the Right Ideal. Religion can be understood rightly in the light of self-consciousness alone. In the next chapter we shall try to show what self-consciousness is. When religion is rightly understood, the distinction between one religion and another will mostly vanish and there will be a single religion all over the world. Croce and Gentile seem to be right generally when they say that religion is a misunderstood form of Philosophy. But Philosophy gets the right direction from religion and without religion it must remain incomplete. Therefore it would be equally correct to say that Philosophy in the present stage of its evolution is a misunderstood form of religion. Religion, rightly understood, is the ultimate truth and all Philosophy and all knowledge are advancing gradually towards it. The highest religion and the highest Philosophy cannot but be identical with each other.

When we have once concluded that the human urge for

ideals is an urge for beauty and perfection, the qualities of the ideal that can satisfy this urge perfectly and permanently can be easily deduced from this conclusion. Since it must be an ideal of the highest and the most perfect beauty it must be free from every defect or blemish that we can think of and must possess upto the highest perfection all the qualities that we by our nature look upon as lovable, admirable and beautiful.

The awareness of the presence of the slightest defect or of the absence of the smallest element of beauty in his ideal suffices to turn the whole of a man's love for it into hatred. Therefore as long as he loves it, he attributes to it, consciously or unconsciously, all the qualities of Beauty and Perfection that he can possibly desire or imagine.

For example, man cannot take for his ideal consciously and deliberately the idea of anything that is dead. He is himself alive and therefore cannot love, admire, adore and serve with self-sacrifice the idea of anything that appears to him to be lifeless and therefore inferior to himself. Moreover the life of his ideal must be eternal, for if he is convinced that his ideal must die some time in the future, he must feel that it is potentially dead even today.

Further, his ideal must possess upto the highest degree all the attributes of life with which man is familiar in his own case. In other words, it must hear, see, understand, feel, love and respond, must have a purpose to be achieved in the human world and must have the power to act for and to succeed in the realization of that purpose. In other words, it must have certain likes and dislikes and possess the power to encourage and advance what it likes and discourage and destroy what it dislikes, to reward its lovers, devotees and friends and punish its enemies and opponents.

If a man's ideal lacks any one of these qualities, it becomes impossible for him to love, admire or serve it. For, if it has no purpose and no likes and dislikes in relation to

human life, how can a man know what he should do and what he should not do in order to serve it? He cannot love his ideal with a love that is incapable of being translated into action. And how can he turn his love into action if he thinks that his ideal cannot hear, see, feel, know, understand or respond to what he does in its service. In such a case he will derive no satisfaction from his activities and will not continue them. What a man regards as virtue is strictly speaking never its own reward. Its nature is always specified by the ideal and it is *always* rewarded by the pleasing conviction that it is approved by the ideal. Moreover, if his ideal lacks such attributes of life, it will not know whether what is going on in the human world is favourable to its purpose or otherwise and will therefore, have no purpose to be achieved in the human world at all. If a man thinks that his ideal is not powerful enough to reward its supporters and punish its enemies successfully or to realize its purpose generally, he will feel that loving and serving it is a hopeless task and that it is weak and helpless and utterly unworthy of his love, admiration or devotion.

Again, the actions of his ideal for the realization of its purposes must be in accordance with the highest moral qualities, because we look upon these qualities as lovable, beautiful and admirable. The perfect beauty of his ideal will necessitate that it possesses these qualities upto the highest degree since these qualities are derived from Goodness which is an aspect of Beauty. Should he think that his ideal lacks any one of these qualities or lacks any one of them in the highest degree, he must consider it as a defect and must cease to love it.

Also, the qualities of his ideal must be unique and unparalleled. For if he thinks that there is something else which has the same qualities as it has, he will have to love two ideals at the same time and this is something which the nature of man does not befit him to do. Man is so made that he can love only one ideal at a time.

Last of all, it is necessary that the creation of the Universe may be completely subordinate to the purpose of his ideal. For, if this is not so, the laws operating in the Universe on the physical, biological and psychological planes may come into a clash with the purpose of his ideal and may never allow it to be realized. This means that the laws operating in the universe must be the creation of his ideal. In other words, his ideal must be no less than the Creator of the Universe itself.

Since these are the qualities that man likes his ideal to possess, therefore no matter what his ideal may be (it may be a stone, an idol, a nation, a race, a country, a creed or an ism), he always attributes these qualities to it, some of them consciously and others unconsciously. Whenever people love a concrete object as an ideal, it is imagined to be the symbol of an abstract perfection possessing all the qualities of Beauty. But the ideal that actually and really possesses these qualities is the Right Ideal and all other ideals are wrong and imperfect and hence unsatisfactory and transient.

Now on the one hand man has a powerful urge to love the idea of an all-powerful moral personality which may be the Creator of the World and on the other hand there is no explanation of the Universe more satisfactory, more convincing and more in accordance with all the known facts of existence than this that the Reality of the Universe is an All-powerful Creative Self-Consciousness which really possesses all the qualities of Goodness, Beauty and Perfection. This means that the Right Ideal of man is no other than the Consciousness of the Universe and that Beauty must be identified with this Consciousness.

Chapter IV

THE GROWTH OF SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS

We have seen that evolution has no other meaning except the evolution of consciousness and that no new species are necessary for future evolution which can now be continued indefinitely by man. Consciousness having once obtained its freedom in the human form of life is now able to add to this freedom as much as it likes. It is also clear that the evolution of consciousness means the evolution of the knowledge of consciousness about itself. Whenever consciousness gains in freedom, it gains also in self-knowledge and vice-versa. Self-consciousness means the freedom of consciousness to know itself. For consciousness, freedom is knowledge and knowledge is freedom.

Self-consciousness is, moreover, synonymous with the knowledge of Beauty. Consciousness knows itself in proportion as it knows beauty and it knows beauty in proportion as it knows itself. Self-knowledge and the knowledge of beauty progress simultaneously. With every fresh knowledge of beauty the self is able to give a further expression to its urge of love, to gain in its own freedom and to unfold or evolve itself a little more. The higher the standard of beauty of a person's ideal the greater is his self-consciousness. Further evolution depends upon our giving a fuller and fuller expression to the urge for ideals.

Self-consciousness grows in man through a knowledge of what is other than the self.

When a child comes into the world he has but a vague knowledge of himself and his surroundings. Gradually, he begins to feel around him the presence of some objects

and also of some persons who come most into contact with him. It is then that he knows of his own existence and can say "I". This knowledge of "I" is the beginning of self-consciousness. With the first knowledge of "I" the urge of self begins to press itself. The child becomes curious and inquisitive as if he is searching for something which he likes or loves but which is not visible to him at the time. "There is surely something around here which is very good for me and which I shall like very much to have," that is his attitude. He wants to know other things not really for the sake of those things but in order to know *himself* in relation to them, to know what is it that *he* really likes or loves. As he gains in his knowledge of things other than himself, he gains in his knowledge of himself.

In the beginning the child's urge of self finds an expression in his attachment to objects capable of satisfying his instinctive desires of which the most important is the desire for eating. This is the first stage in the growth of his self-consciousness. After some time—and this marks the beginning of the second stage in the growth of his self-consciousness—he begins to appreciate, at first unconsciously and later on consciously, the greatness and goodness of some people around him, who are at the outset his parents and teachers. These people become the ideal of his self. He loves to become like them. He is happy when he is able to win their approval and love and unhappy when he is unable to do so. As he grows in years, the circle of his acquaintances is enlarged and he is able to get a more general notion of greatness and goodness based on the opinions of those people in the extended circle of his society, whom he admires or loves consciously or unconsciously. Then he begins to seek the approval of such persons and feels happy when he achieves it and miserable when he is unable to do so. With every extension of social relations his idea of beauty is refined, improved and enlarged a little more and his self-consciousness is corresponding-

ly developed. This process of the growth of self-consciousness, with an improved knowledge of social relations, goes on for ever, sometimes slowly and at others quickly. At every step in the development of his self-consciousness the individual has an ideal, which is at the same time the idea of the highest beauty known to him. But no ideal is able to meet the full requirements of the urge of self. Every ideal, therefore, yields place to another one after some time. The individual really loves something the beauty of which excels that of every one of the ideals chosen by him from time to time. For some time he identifies the ideal chosen by him with the object of his real desire but he is soon disillusioned. As soon as one ideal loses its charm, the individual chooses another ideal more beautiful than the previous one, in the hope that it will satisfy his desire completely. In this way his ideal rises in the scale of beauty step by step till he reaches the Right Ideal which is the real desire of his self. The knowledge of the Right Ideal, as we shall presently see, has also a course of evolution. This means that a person's idea of beauty continues to evolve for ever.

The evolution of ideals proceeds generally in accordance with the following principles.

The self has a tendency to discard all ideals except one. It has many ideals in the beginning. For the child every instinctive desire is an ideal. It is only gradually that the approval of parents is valued by him in such a way that he feels the necessity of controlling some of his instinctive desires not liked by them. When the child grows in years, he feels that there are other persons besides his parents, *e.g.* his teachers, whom he can admire or love. A grown up person too remains under the influence of many ideals for some time. In the beginning, these ideals are conflicting and inharmonious with one another. Gradually, they come into comparison with each other in the light of his internal desire for beauty with the ultimate result that they are more and more superseded and controlled by a single all power-

ful idea, which becomes the ideal of the self. A person feeling the influence of more than one ideal is very low in the standard of his self-consciousness.

The ideal shifts from the concrete to the abstract. The self yearns for something of which the beauty is permanent and unlimited. A man whose ideal is his child, for example, must feel that he is sure to be miserable in case he should die. Therefore in his saner moments he tries to fix his attention on something more permanent as a source of joy or consolation for himself. This joy or consolation can never be complete unless the ideal becomes completely abstract. In the above case the reason for the man's dissatisfaction with his ideal is quite obvious but there is a lack of satisfaction in the case of all concrete ideals even if the ideal is concrete-general *e.g.*, the love of children generally. The reason is that a concrete ideal however much we may extend it still remains limited. No ideal except the Right Ideal is completely abstract. Since the self is a social self and owes the knowledge of its very existence to its social relations, its ideal must always have a clear or vague, conscious or unconscious, reference to a person. Ultimately its ideal takes the form of an approval of some person or persons. The self cannot love any thing outside its concrete social relations although its tendency is to love the abstract and to love it all the more, the more abstract it is. Plato was right when he said that the more abstract the beautiful, the more beautiful it is. When we love persons, we really love their abstract qualities. When their qualities fail to satisfy us, we turn to other models with more perfect qualities. Thus even in the concrete the self loves the abstract.

The ideal shifts also from the less perfect to the more perfect. An ideal must be perfectly satisfactory to us whether it has intrinsic perfection or whether we attribute perfection to it owing to an error, otherwise it will not be chosen by us as an ideal at all. Whenever we are dissatisfied

with an ideal, we turn our love to another idea, guided by our desire for perfection. Love is a function of the self which the self must always perform. The self desires to love as permanently and as completely as it has the capacity to love. It changes to a new ideal only when the existing ideal is unable to give full scope to this craving of the self, that is, when the ideal is found to be lacking in perfection. Love wants to persist and grow and the self is, therefore, compelled to abandon an ideal which does not permit the continuous growth of love. Permanence is also a quality of perfection. An ideal which lacks permanence lacks perfection.

Only that object or idea becomes the ideal of which the beauty is actually felt and realized by the self and not merely understood by it intellectually or remembered on the authority of another person. The ideal is beauty and beauty can be known by feeling and not by intellect. It is quite possible that we may understand intellectually the greatness and excellence of one object and may feel and experience the greatness and excellence of a different object. The ideal develops in perfection through the self's performance of its function of loving. Because the self loves, it comes to know more and more what it should love. The self's knowledge of itself and the knowledge of beauty grow simultaneously. The growth of self-knowledge consists in the self getting to know ever more and more what it is that is worthy of its love or capable of conducing to its greatest happiness and completeness.

Society is an indispensable instrument in the growth of self-consciousness. Social contacts engender and improve the idea of beauty. Culture is the result of a refined idea of beauty, developed through the extended knowledge of social surroundings. In the absence of society a human being will surely sink to the level of a brute.

The transition of self from one ideal to another may be either sudden or gradual. Many ideas exist side by side with the ideal competing for the place of the ideal. But

as long as an idea attracts the self most of all, it remains the ideal and all other ideas subserve it. Whenever the ideal begins to lose its attractiveness, some other idea begins to encroach upon the self's love and to appear more and more beautiful till the ideal is made to abandon the position of a ruling idea in its favour and to assume a subordinate role. If the rising of one idea and the lowering of another in the self's estimate of beauty is not simultaneous the condition is known as a shock or, in mild cases, a worry. It is due to the fact that the urge of self is thwarted and is unable to have the expression that it was having. As long as a person is unable to get an equally attractive substitute for a discarded ideal or for an ideal that has lost its charm, he feels dejected and depressed and may suffer from nervous diseases.

Every ideal prescribes a law which becomes the effective moral code of the individual. Every person has to observe a code of do's and donot's in order to achieve the ideal chosen by him. He follows this code willingly urged by his love for the ideal which is internal. He requires no external compulsion to submit to the rigid moral discipline imposed by the ideal. As there is no escape from an ideal, so there is no escape from a moral code for any human being.

The nature of the law prescribed by the ideal depends, of course, on the nature and the quality of the ideal. In vain some of us condemn Machiavelli and Lenin for their advocacy of irreligious morality. Each one of them emphasises the moral code prescribed by his own ideal. Machiavelli favoured treachery, perfidy and cruelty on the part of a king, because that alone could serve adequately his ideal which was the state. Lenin believed Communism to be the greatest good for humanity. Hence the correctness and incorrectness of human conduct were according to him, determined by this one ideal. Cruelty and immorality, in the ordinary sense of the words, were perfectly right if they could facilitate a Communist revolution.

The change from one ideal to another is due to the internal desire of consciousness for beauty which serves as an ultimate criterion of the ideal's beauty. If an ideal satisfies this desire perfectly and permanently, it is beautiful otherwise it is lacking in beauty. Sometimes, no doubt, it is the external events that prove to the self that the ideal is unworthy of it. But what gives meaning to the external events is the self's desire for perfection which ultimately acts as an unfailing touchstone for testing the satisfactory or unsatisfactory character of an ideal. Gradually, as the mutual relationship of the self and the ideal develops, the self is able to discover whether its companion is worthy of friendship or not. If the ideal is wrong, it contains its own contradiction which is revealed to the self in the course of time.

The disillusionment of the self is caused by the urge of its nature which cannot be satisfied with any thing except perfection. The external causes, if there are any, determine the self in favour of a change only because there is an internal attitude which gives them an import.

The *third stage* promising an unlimited growth of self-consciousness begins as soon as the self begins to feel the presence and beauty of its most important other, the World-Self. The way for it is prepared by the second stage in which the tendencies of the self press already towards an abstract, single, universal, and perfect ideal and now by loving the World-Self the self finds it possible to give a complete expression to all these tendencies and add to its satisfaction thereby. The self's idea of its own existence is the out-come of its relation with society; therefore, while it remains in the second stage of self-consciousness, it cannot have an abstract ideal of this kind because by having such an ideal it would at once lose contact with its social surroundings which is an impossibility. The World-Consciousness alone provides us with an ideal which is abstract, single, universal and perfect and at the same time social, personal and living. This is the only ideal which

satisfies completely the urge of self. The self, if it remains true to its nature, discovers very soon that it is its own ideal, that it is the only ideal which is capable of giving it the greatest happiness and satisfaction.

Because the World-Self is hidden from our view, it is not, for this reason, the less knowable than other-selves known to us. The way in which I can know it, is not essentially different from the way in which I can know, for example, one of any best friends. Every self is invisible to the eyes of our physical body, eyes which can see the physical objects, and the World-Self is no exception to this rule. The physical body of the human self is not the self; it is simply an expression and an instrument of the self. I know my friend to be what he is not because I see *him*, that is, his self, with these eyes, which I cannot do, but because I see the signs of the activity of his self and get a feeling or an intuition (not a perfectly rational, logical, or scientific knowledge) that he is a self like me, capable of thinking, behaving, responding, creating, loving and hating and not merely a robot or an automaton. Thus my friend is hidden from my view as well as manifest to me; he is one and yet multiple by reason of the multiple ways in which he expresses himself. I know that which is one and hidden by means of that which is manifest and multiple. Such is the case with the World-Self too. It is one and hidden, it is manifest and multiple, and we know the one and hidden by means of that which is manifest and multiple in the form of nature or Universe.

Our contemplation of nature, which is, of course unavoidable on account of our very close association with it, supplies us with the very first knowledge of a Creator, a knowledge which forms the basis of our further knowledge about Him. It is indeed a blessing that nature affords us with a glimpse of the beautiful and the real, literally for nothing, every time that we contemplate it. The heavens, the sun, the moon, and the stars, the mountains, the landscape, the vast oceans, the twilight and the dawn, the clouds,

the rivers, the streams, the winds, the change of day and night, the rotation of seasons, the animal and vegetable life in all its variety, complexity and richness, create in us the idea, however vague and unconscious it may be in the case of some of us, of a Creator, of his greatness, his beauty and power. Nature is only one of the names we give to this Creator, though we may not be conscious of it. Imperceptibly, this idea enters our heart and lingers there, whether we know it or not. Sometimes we become conscious of the idea and then it grows in clearness and force. At other times we are unconscious of it, and it is so suppressed that we forget it and even deny that we have it. We may even condemn it or oppose and disprove it with the help of logic or science but it is always there and rises to the surface of consciousness at times, particularly when we are in difficulties or happen to be overtaken by a misfortune. Then we express it in the form of prayers.

All men pray, although some men pray for a short time or on rare occasions in their lives. Atheism, if it ever exists, exists only on the lips but never in the hearts of men. The reason why we come to have the idea of a Creator is not only external to us, being attributable to our contact with the Universe around us, but it is also internal. As already mentioned, we carry with us latent in our nature a desire for a being great and beautiful which is the search of our consciousness. Thus the indication of external nature and the internal desire find a contact with each other and corroborate each other. The more we are conscious of this contact or corroboration the more do we feel at home in this world and the greater is our happiness and joy on account of being assured of our own reality. As a matter of fact, the reason why we believe in a Creator is more internal than external. Without an internal desire for a perfect being, we would have never been able to admire nature or to imbibe the idea of a Creator from its contemplation. All knowledge of Reality lies within us.

Nature only awakens it and then, if it is permitted to have its natural course, it goes on adding to itself. It is perfectly right to say that every knowledge of Divine-Consciousness that we achieve is also the knowledge of our own consciousness. *To believe in the Creator is to believe in one's own self.*

The Universe or Nature is alive and conscious because it is the conscious activity of the World-Self. It is dynamic and progressive and not static or finished because change is a property of conscious activity. Yet the Creator is not immanent in the Universe nor is a part or the whole of the Universe identical with Him. Just as I am apart from the book I am writing, the Creator is apart from the Universe of His creation. I express myself in this book but I am not this book because I can write many other books and do many other things besides. The Universe, however old it may be and however long it may continue to exist, is but a moment in the life-history of the Creator who can and will create, for aught that we can understand of Him, innumerable such or different worlds in future. His qualities are eternal and must function eternally.

Yet, when I am writing the book and the book is evolving, my thought, my creative desire, my consciousness, in fact I myself with all my attributes and qualities, happen to be flowing in the book and pushing forward the process of its evolution. Similarly, as the Creator is evolving the Universe, His thought, His desire, His consciousness, indeed He Himself, with all His qualities and attributes is there in the Universe pushing forward the process of its evolution. As I am in the book that I am writing with all my attributes in spite of being apart from the book, so the Creator is in the Universe with all His attributes, in spite of being apart from the Universe. It is in this sense that I have talked of *the creative flow of consciousness in the Universe* throughout in this book. This point, a fuller elucidation of which will be found in the analogy of the artist and the picture given in Chapter V of this book, resolves the controversy of the immanence and the

transcendence of the Creator.

The whole of our knowledge of Divine-Consciousness, like our knowledge of human consciousness, is not scientific or rational knowledge in the current sense of the word rationality. It is of the nature of a feeling, a sensitiveness, an intuition, a faith or a direct vision. Feeling is not only knowledge but it is also the highest kind of knowledge. Reason, no doubt, gives a spur to feeling but feeling knows much more than mere reason can know. Reason can know only a part but feeling grasps the whole of an object or an idea. How little is it realized that knowledge under the influence of which we mould the whole of our life is never purely logical, rational or intellectual! It is of the nature of a feeling although intellect serves to direct this feeling more or less. We do what we like to do and not what is reasonable or rationally or mathematically correct. Love and not logic is the guiding principle of our life. The urge of human life, as we have seen, is love or the feeling of beauty. Intellect cannot become an urge because it cannot feel or know beauty. A scientist can tell us how sound is produced but he cannot tell us why a symphony is beautiful. He can calculate exactly the area covered by a picture, can explain what part is played by the rays of light, the retina, the optical nerve or the brain in observing it, or enumerate to the minutest details the shades of colours used in it but he cannot say in what does the beauty of the picture consist. He may himself feel its beauty but he cannot demonstrate it logically or scientifically. The knowledge of beauty is open to feeling alone. It is outside the approach of rationality.

Feeling is the activity of the self as a whole; intellect is only an aspect of it. The self sees the whole while the intellect sees only a part. Recently the configuration or the *gestalt* school of psychology has laid stress on the importance of "the whole", "an all" or "a totality" as knowable only by a direct vision or sensitiveness. A picture

or a symphony constitutes a whole which is much more than the sum of its parts and parts alone fall within the province of reason.

There is no doubt that intuition errs but that does not detract from its value because, finally, it is only intuition that does not err, since it alone is capable of reaching the regions of that knowledge which the self is ever demanding. The self wants and loves beauty (mistaken or real) and to know beauty we can only depend upon feeling ultimately. Reason accompanies us for some time but our final destination, the ideal, wrong or right, can be reached only by feeling.

Because reason goes with us a part of the way, we are simple enough to forget when we reach the end of our path, that it had left us long ago and that the more important part of the journey was traversed by us in the company of feeling. It is faith, feeling or intuition which stimulates the philosopher and even the scientist to embark on the search for truth. Intellect gives a spur to intuition and makes it active in a particular direction but the truth is first of all felt, intuited or believed, however vaguely it may be, and then discovered or rather demonstrated logically by reason as far as possible and what is possible for reason to demonstrate, in this way, never amounts to the whole of that which is intuited by the self directly. Conversely, what we consider as scientific or rational knowledge is never rational to a perfection and contains a good deal of the admixture of faith, intuition or feeling. That is one reason why scientific knowledge is always changing and altering itself.

If nature were to leave man to his intellect and take away faith from him, all his activities would come to a dead stop everywhere. If faith did not enter into my knowledge of my friend, I could have taken him easily for an automaton rather than a human being like myself. A person. who makes up his mind to believe only in facts which can be established scientifically or

rationally, will be able to do nothing in this world. Without faith I cannot even believe that the Sun will rise tomorrow or that a stone will fall to the ground when dropped from my hand any time to-day. Yet I act actually taking such things for hard facts. Faith is the spur of life. If we take up the attitude that what cannot be proved rationally belongs to the realm of the supernatural, the superstitious or the unseen, then it is a fact that we are (every one of us is) believing in the supernatural, the superstitious or the unseen every moment of our life, in spite of this scientific age and shall continue to do so in future whatever Science may have to say or do. To depend upon faith for most of our beliefs and actions is not our weakness but rather our strength. We are strong only when we are true to our nature. We desire beauty and strive after beauty and beauty can be known by means of faith, feeling or intuition alone.

The activity of feeling or intuition to know beauty or consciousness is known as prayer. Prayer is the contemplation of beauty. It makes its first natural and unavoidable beginnings in the case of every man in the form of his contemplation of the beauty of nature. All men pray to their Creator but few of them know that they do so. When the feeling or the desire for beauty has been awakened in a natural way by our contemplation of the beauty of the Universe around us, we need to express it and there is no other way of expressing it except by praying. The feeling, the love or the desire for beauty becomes stronger and grows without a limit if we continue to give it an adequate expression by praying regularly. If we do not express it in this way, which is the right way, then, since it must have an expression of some kind, it is perverted and diverted to wrong channels. The result is that sooner or later we suffer from all the harm that must come to us as a consequence of suppressing and misdirecting this desire of our nature.

It was said above that atheism is impossible. A

passage of professor James', the well-known psychologist, throws some light on this point. "It seems", says professor James "that in spite of all that Science may say or do to the contrary, men will continue to pray to the end of time, unless their mental nature changes in a manner which nothing we know should lead us to expect. The impulse to pray is a necessary consequence of the fact that whilst the inner most of the empirical selves of a man is a self of the social sort yet it can find its adequate socius (its great companion) in an ideal world. Most men either continuously or occasionally carry a reference to it in their breasts. The humblest outcast on this earth can feel himself to be real and valid by means of this higher recognition. And on the other hand, for most of us, a world with no such inner refuge, when the outer social self failed and dropped from us, would be the abyss of horror. I say for most of us because it is probable that men differ a good deal in the degree in which they are haunted by this sense of an ideal spectator. It is a much more essential part of the consciousness of some men than of others. Those who have the most of it are possibly the most religious men. But I am sure that even those who say they are altogether without it deceive themselves and really have it in some degree".

What is prayer if not an expression of the feeling of the greatness, goodness and power or, to use only one word, the beauty of a Creator. All men pray at one time or another in their lives. All men therefore possess this feeling. That the impulse to pray is universal is again an indication that it has its root in something which is a part of our nature.

Unfortunately, we have not yet understood the real significance of our desire for prayer. It is the most powerful and the most important urge of human life making its first push for an outlet along the only channel that can offer it a free, full and continued expression. It is the desire for Beauty pressing for satisfaction. It is the cross-road sign of nature leading to the road of happiness. It is

the voice of nature calling man to freedom, progress and power. If we listen to this voice, it becomes louder, more eloquent and more explicit and talks out to us the secrets of existence, the meaning of human life and the purpose of the Universe. If we stifle this voice, we give ourselves up to error and ultimate distress and sorrow which must persist so long as we do not listen to it again. We cannot escape from ourselves; it is impossible for us to shed our own nature.

In our ignorance, we deprive our initial feeling or desire for beauty, which is the result of our necessary contact with and contemplation of nature, of its adequate, natural expression in the form of prayers. We suppress it and try to kill it but it cannot be killed. It only diverts itself into other channels. No desire of our nature can be killed altogether unless it may be in the service of a really strong desire of a higher order. When we refuse to express a desire naturally, without seeking a substitute gratification in a higher desire, it is frustrated only in its natural form but manages to find expression in other perverted ways which are unnatural and injurious. A desire is a flow of energy; checked at one point it must (like a current of water) seek an outlet at some other point. If, on account of the check, the energy of the impulse stops its flow and accumulates like a pool of water, it is known as a repression or a complex which is still more injurious. The desire for beauty cannot be sacrificed for the sake of a higher desire, since we have no desire higher than this. When it is denied its natural expression in the form of prayers, it is compelled to satisfy itself by means of substitutes, *i.e.*, we take to other ideals leaving aside our own ideal, the ideal of beauty. As we violate our nature, we prepare the way for our own future disappointments and miseries and, when they come, we return to praying once more. *A man who does not pray leads an unnatural and abnormal life*. He is either depriving his strongest desire of all satisfaction or is else feeling unreasonably interested, over-interested, in

certain things in which the urge of his self is wrongly finding an expression. He is either already worried and anxious or worries and anxieties are preparing to overtake him.

Why do we pray when surrounded by difficulties and disappointments? The desire to pray is the natural desire of the self for its own ideal. It is not caused by a disappointment or a misfortune. It is always there but becomes attached to wrong ideals. Whenever these wrong ideals play us false, as they must on account of their unreal character and their incompatibility with our nature, the desire for prayer is disengaged and set free. We had misused and misdirected it and now it finds the opportunity to go its own way. Misfortune consists in the inevitable, forced detachment of this desire from an idea which proves unsatisfactory to the self and the consolation and the satisfaction that we derive from prayers is due to its reattachment to an idea that is most satisfactory to the self, that is, to the idea of the Divine Consciousness. Every misfortune is at bottom a sense of loneliness on the part of self, caused by the failure of wrong ideals—faithless companions always. Whenever the self, having lost contact with its only "adequate socius" the Divine Consciousness or the Right Ideal, seeks the company of a wrong ideal, its urge remains unsatisfied but this fact is discovered by the self only when the wrong, faithless companion has actually deserted it. The self calls this discovery a misfortune and feels it hard to bear. At this juncture it has no course left open to it except to return to its own companion whom it had deserted in the beginning, owing to an error. Thus we find a man in distress engaged in prayers. Misfortune is nothing to a man who does not break company with the True Companion. Such a man has other companions too but he always gives them their proper place. Their faithless character is already known and therefore, when they fail him, he takes the event as a matter of course and is neither pained nor disappointed unduly.

The desire for prayer on the part of a man overtaken by a misfortune is not then the result of the misfortune. On the other hand it is the misfortune that is the result of a repressed and frustrated desire for prayers which is a part of the nature of self and which is always pressing for satisfaction. The cause of the misfortune is the nature of the self's desire which cannot be satisfied by anything except by a perfect and permanent companion and which expresses itself normally and naturally in the form of prayers.

A misfortune is a blessing in disguise. If it is acute enough to compel a man to return to his own ideal, it should serve to open his eyes once and for all. But unfortunately we pray only in difficulties and do not keep up our contact with the Right Ideal continuously. We are too ready to take to wrong ideals not heeding for the call of the only friend that is a friend in need. This is an ungratefulness that harms nobody but ourselves and indeed we pay for it very dearly. Contact with Consciousness must be maintained and developed continuously by means of strictly regular habits of prayers. This is the only way in which we can protect ourselves from the attraction of wrong ideals which are always ready to mislead us into error and trouble.

Prayer is the highest and the most valuable experience of man. It is the communion of the human consciousness with its source, the Divine Consciousness. It is the journey of self towards its destination. It is the meeting of lovers long separated, lovers who have searched for each other long and hard through ages of evolution. The habit of praying, if continued, soon leads the self to a great revelation. The self feels calm, contented and peaceful as if it has found all that it had wanted. The communion of lovers develops into a permanent alliance animated, inspired and strengthened by an ever-increasing love and confidence. Every act of worship, in case it embodies an adequate expression of the existing feeling of beauty,

leads to a new glimpse of the beautiful and adds to the intensity and the strength of the feeling of beauty. Love goes on increasing in this way till it develops into a powerful ideal swaying the whole life of the individual, reducing all previous ideals to mere subservient ideas and depriving them of power to interrupt the free movement of the self towards the Right Ideal. They are successfully combated and subdued by the growing love of the Right Ideal. The task is difficult and requires patience and effort but this is a condition of every human achievement.

Prayer involves an attitude of self-negation which is really due to the self's feeling of incompleteness in the presence of its beloved and the consequent desire for completeness. Self-negation is an effort for approach to the beloved and therefore results ultimately in self-affirmation, power and confidence. Nothing short of a sincere repentance expressed in an attitude of perfect humility, devotion and self-effacement and capable of bringing tears to the eyes as profusely as possible, can bring the self to its own, since it is only in this way that the self is able to shed the desires that are not its own, the desires that are out of harmony with its nature. This is the process of the self's purification from the love of undesirable ideals with which it has associated itself for some time and which it has loved erroneously, much to its own loss. This process is necessary because the self's store of love has to be made available for the Right Ideal. The most suitable time for such an ablution of tears is the last part of the night when conditions of quiet, seclusion and a complete detachment from the world are particularly favourable for concentration and inner effort.

The greater the self's freedom from the love of ideals which are foreign to its real nature, the greater its approach to its own ideal of beauty. With every fresh knowledge of beauty the self not only adds to its own freedom but also to its own self-knowledge: it becomes more and more

self-conscious, emerges out of its material wrappings and regains itself bit by bit. The knowledge of self and the knowledge of beauty advance simultaneously, carrying forward the process of evolution, till self-consciousness achieves the loftiest heights possible to be achieved by the self in this physical world. When this happens the human consciousness feels an irresistible pull of attraction towards its beloved, the Divine Consciousness and for a time feels one with it, as a needle which is brought gradually towards a magnet is lifted by it automatically as soon as it is sufficiently close to it. As long as the self remains in this state—and it is only for a short time that it remains in this state—it forgets its own independence. It is no longer in touch with time and space because it is one with the Creator of both.

The experience is beyond all description. It marks the highest evolution and the fullest liberation of the self. It is the greatest, the most intoxicating and most exhilarating joy known to man. Every other pleasure looks pale and insignificant by the side of it. A similar but lesser joy gradually increasing was being experienced by the evolving consciousness on its way behind, guiding it towards further effort by giving it hope and consolation and now here was its culmination. So great is the joy that sometimes the lover does not want to return from the state of bliss he has reached. But this is disobedience to the beloved and the result of it is the loss of mind. The self loses contact with the world of matter because it does not want to maintain this contact. The punishment is of its own choice. The true lover not only knows that his role is that of a servant but also that the highest realization of his love will come only through service. He submits to the beloved with the whole of his being, which includes his faculties for action. He approaches him not with a view to lose himself but in order to regain himself, to come to his own and to develop the best of his capacities for action. He would rather be at a distance from the beloved in order

to maintain his independence than approach him and lose it because that is the way in which he can be true to his love. When the culminating point of evolution is, therefore, reached, he does not feel that he has passed away into the embrace of the beloved but he feels that the beloved has passed into his own embrace. With him the ultimate experience is not that of a complete self-effacement but that of a complete self-affirmation in which the independence of self is fully maintained. He is able to have such a feeling at the highest point of his progress because he maintains it and protects it carefully all along. This feeling is due to his attitude of service and action which became fixed and unshakable in the course of the development of his self-consciousness, which of course took place by a gradual process. He looked upon his devotional exercises throughout not as a source of pleasure which was an incidental gain but as a source of power for action which was what he really desired. His principle source of pleasure was action and service. He was always acting with the whole of his ever-increasing strength to win the favour of the beloved and his attention was, therefore, concentrated throughout on the pleasure he derived from action in his service than from his mere company. In fact with him action was the most pleasant form of company of the beloved. When such a true lover reaches the state of his highest self-development, it is not a state of complete self-obliviousness but rather that of a complete self-consciousness. So deeply is he absorbed in the love of the Creator, at certain times, that he cannot help feeling as if he is the Creator himself. But he does not identify himself with the Creator and always knows that such a feeling is no more than an error engendered by his intense love. A piece of iron kept in fire for sometime does not lose its identity but it becomes so hot and red that it is difficult to distinguish it from the fire in which it is placed. So in the periods of its intense love for the Creator the loving self does not lose its identity but still finds it difficult to distinguish

itself from the Creator. Such periods are however not long. The lover wants to return to his real position as a devoted servant and therefore returns to it soon. The self in his case dives deeply into the sea of its own knowledge but rises to the surface again ready to direct the knowledge so gained to its end—the service of the beloved. Soaked with beauty and power he is urged to lead a dynamic life which becomes the wonder of humanity.

The true lover feels a joy in winning the beloved's pleasure by means of service that is in *striving* to approach him rather than in *approaching* him actually and finally. A sense of actual approach means the end of further progress and further approach while really there can be no end to the lover's progress or approach. The demand of his love is to seek the beloved for ever without reaching him. He knows that the actual approach, should it come, will diminish his joy and he therefore, tries to keep apart from the beloved, so that he may ever have the unique joy of winning his pleasure and gaining his nearness by action and effort. He wants to keep apart in order that he may ever continue to approach, conflicting needs which he reconciles by finding ever fresh opportunities for service and action and such opportunities can never be lacking as long as the world does not reach its perfection or as long as there are other selves who have yet to attain to their highest self-consciousness.

A living cell in an organism has two capacities. Firstly, it is a complete individual, a complete organism by itself and must function for the maintenance of its own health and growth. Secondly, it is a part of a whole which is the whole organism. Its health depends upon the health of the organism and the health of the organism depends upon it. If it is sufficiently healthy itself it passes on its health to the organism and thereby gains in health itself. It cannot be perfectly healthy unless the whole organism is healthy. Similarly, every human self has two capacities. It is a complete individual by itself and at the same time it

is a part of a whole which is ultimately the whole of the human society. A human self can, therefore, reach its ultimate perfection not individually but only in the whole of which it is a part. The ultimate destination of every self is not only its own highest evolution but also the highest evolution of the whole of the human race. An ardent lover, therefore, does not feel contented with his own individual achievements. He does not feel satisfied with himself unless he is doing all that he can, to aid the evolution of the whole of the human race. Every effort that he puts forth in order to aid the evolution of the rest of humanity enables him to satisfy a bit more of the urge of his consciousness and to add further to his own self-consciousness in his capacity as an individual and this process can continue indefinitely.

The urge of human consciousness is not only to reach its own perfection but also to bring the whole of humanity to a perfection because the urge of human consciousness is the same as the urge of Divine Consciousness. The divine manifestation or realization can never reach its completeness or perfection in a single isolated individual. The perfection of the whole of the human society and not that of a single individual is the ideal of the Creator. The true lover, therefore, changes the world by action so as to make it suit more and more the common purpose of his beloved as well as his own. His action is creative action like the action of his beloved, the Creator, because it is directly and consciously helpful to evolution and conforms to the purpose of creation. He functions in accordance with his proper role as the deputy of the Creator on earth. It is such a man who achieves a real union with the Creator because he acts in a way in which the Creator would act Himself. It is the purpose of the Creator that takes a human shape in his person and becomes active in the world. We shall come across such a person as a Moses, a Christ or a Mohammad. He appears as a reformer who

knows where reform is needed or as a preacher struggling against ignorance or as a martyr sacrificing himself for the victory of truth or as a general fighting the war of justice and peace or as a political leader opposing the rule of tyranny and oppression or more commonly as an ordinary man of the world, not lesser than any of the heroes mentioned above, who sets a worthy example to other men by leading a life of industry, honesty, patience and righteousness in the face of difficulties. But a hero inspired by the love of his Creator is not to be confused with other heroes, who display their heroism in the service of wrong ideals. His sacrifices alone are directed to the right end and count for anything directly useful to humanity.

"Love" transforms the whole life of an individual. A lover feels real and immortal. He is filled with hope, courage and confidence. He feels perfectly at home in this world. In him alone can we find a high personality or even a genuinely good character. He is coloured deeply in the attributes of his Creator. He is kind and generous to all human beings of all colours, castes, creeds and nationalities. He is truthful, upright, brave, merciful, strong, independent, self-respecting, courteous, social, magnanimous and forbearing. The reason is that fear which is the cause of all vices leaves him once for all. What is the cause of fear? We fear when we think we may not get what we desire. When we are dominated by fear we resort to lies, treacheries, diplomacy, deceit, fraud, malice, flattery, theft, murder, cowardice and cruelty. The lover need have no fear since his only desire is the pleasure of the beloved. Like other human beings, he desires to have a nice share of the good things of this world but since all such desires are subordinate to his one desire—the pleasure of the beloved—he wants to get them by right methods, that is, methods consistent with the pleasure of the beloved or not at all. He alone, by the way, knows what is right and what is wrong. Without slackening his efforts he is

confident that he will continue to get every thing that the beloved desires and beyond that he wants nothing. The desire of the beloved is his own desire. So what should he fear except fear itself and the resulting vice. His only fear is the displeasure of the beloved and that relieves him of every other variety of fear. His only love is the pleasure of the beloved and that relieves him of all other loves. This is the true emancipation of the self and this alone can ennoble the character or raise the personality of the individual.

A self-conscious man cannot be a slave. Self-consciousness and slavery are terms incompatible with each other. Self-consciousness means a perfect freedom to act. It is possible only when the self is acting under the single, unmixed influence of its own ideal, while slavery imposes ideals of its own. As soon as a self-conscious man begins to act, or is restrained from acting, under the influence of another ideal, he is no longer self-conscious. He is a slave. He will maintain his freedom as well as his self-consciousness only if he comes into a conflict with the ideal which is foreign to his nature and which interferes with his activities in the service of his own ideal. In this conflict he must continue to fight till he wins a victory for himself even if it involves the loss of his life. The moment love ceases to grow it ceases to exist. A lover who disobeys a definite demand of his love of which he has become conscious is not a lover at all. Love cannot grow and cannot even exist if it makes a compromise with any of its obstacles. It must meet and destroy them. The self wants to be ruled only by a single desire, that for its own ideal. With the exception of this desire, all other desires have to be combated and subdued. Whenever the self is able to rule for the sake of its ideal, a desire which was ruling it once, it grows in self-consciousness, evolves itself, becomes free and gains in strength. The freedom and the strength so gained are used again for overcoming more obstacles and thus by removing its bonds and fetters of slavery one after the

other it grows in self-consciousness. Th eself evolves in order to rule every thing except its own ideal by which it loves to be ruled itself because, as long as it continues to be ruled by other ideals, it is not free to love, adore and obey its own ideal.

Slavery can be due only to a wrong love or, which is the same thing, to a wrong fear. Sometimes the wrong love may be only the love of the body and its desires and the wrong fear may be only the fear of death and physical inconvenience. Ultimately, all kinds of slavery are due to internal causes which means wrong loves and wrong fears. No one can be a slave unless he accepts to be a slave and no one can accept to be a slave unless he has the love of a wrong ideal. The love of every wrong ideal is a covering of matter which the self needs to outgrow.

The complete liberation or the highest consciousness of the self should not be considered as an achievement of some persons gifted with special faculties developed by special exercises and activities or as a peculiarity of certain mystics or religious minded or eccentric people who devote their life to worship and prefer to remain out of touch with the world. It is the achievement of every self that functions normally and naturally. Every self is similar to every other self in its functions and qualities. Every self has the same urge for beauty. Every self must therefore reach the same destination if it is able to have a smooth way for itself. The goal of the highest self-consciousness is the inevitable goal to which every self is driven consciously or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly, by the forces of its own nature, which, since this nature is permanent, must continue to operate even beyond death. We can delay it, if we choose, at a huge cost to ourselves, but we cannot escape it ultimately. But why should we try to escape it? It is all that we really desire; everything else that we desire is only a mistaken, unsatisfactory substitute for it which we are bound to discard sooner or later and the sooner we discard it the better.

Every self can attain to as much of its own consciousness and liberation as is possible for it to attain in this physical world. But just as the intellectual capacities of men vary, their capacities for love also vary. All men can learn and become educated but some are abler than others and some are geniuses gifted with originality and creative intellects. Similarly, in some gifted persons consciousness attains to such lofty heights of its own knowledge that through them it is able to dictate its own law to the world. These persons, known as prophets, are the spiritual leaders of our race in whom the liberation of consciousness achieves creative results. Their guidance is a great blessing for mankind because it puts a stagnating world once again on the road of progress and prosperity, spares it from the hardships of seeking the truth by the dangerous method of trial and error and inspires it with hope, power and confidence. It is only from such persons that we can acquire an adequate knowledge of human nature, of the real desires of self and the ways and means of their satisfaction as well as of our errors and slips and the manner in which they may be avoided. The subject of prophethood will, however, be discussed more fully in another chapter of this book.

Men who attain to the highest liberation of the self are not peculiar unwordly people but they are, as a matter of fact, the real worldly-wise practical men who alone are able to make the most of their worldly life in all its aspects. They live the richest the fullest and the most abundant life possible because they alone know the right and the wrong of every thing not merely in theory but in practice. They are free from doubts and fears because they are inspired by a single ideal which they love with all the love of which they are capable. They alone are able to enjoy their wordly life to the fullest extent. They get the maximum out of it and make the most of it because their urge to love is completely and permanently satisfied. Love, permanent and full, alone is the joy of life.

In the state of its own highest consciousness the self becomes free from the shackles of what is known as determinism. Determinism is nothing but the purpose of the Creator working in man and the Universe. In the case of a man who is yet struggling for the freedom of his consciousness, the purpose of the Creator which is the cause of His free, creative activity in the Universe, is an external force acting on the will. But in the case of a man who has attained to the highest liberation of the self, the purpose of the World-Self ceases to be an external force and becomes identical with the will of the man himself. It becomes his own freely chosen and cherished desire. The man becomes a co-worker with the Divine-Self towards an end which is desired as much by him as by the Divine Self. This does not mean that the human self merely submits to the compulsion of the Divine Self willingly because it cannot do otherwise or that it makes this purpose its own because it finds that it has no alternative but to reconcile itself to it. It means much more than this. Not only does the human self reconcile itself to the purpose of the Creator but the Creator too reconciles Himself to the purpose of the human self so that whatever it wills comes to pass. The human self at the highest stage of its self-consciousness works not only with the purpose of the Creator but also with the power of the Creator behind it. It is the conscious activity of the Creator that flows into the channel of and assumes the form of the conscious activity of the human self and to the extent to which it is so, that is, to the extent the human self is carrying out the purpose of the Creator, the powers of the Creator lie at its disposal. The Divine Self is, in a way, relieved by the human self of a portion of its task of creation. Yet it is the Creator who really acts through the agency of the human self. The human self does for the Creator what the Creator would have done for Himself and the Creator does for the human self what the human self would have done for itself.

The process of evolution is the process by means of which consciousness is expressing itself, that is, its powers and possibilities in creation. This process is pushed forward by the drive or the urge of consciousness. To the extent consciousness has not yet been able to express itself in matter at any time, it depends upon its own hidden powers to carry on the process of evolution and to the extent it has been able to express itself in matter, it depends upon its powers, expressed in matter, to continue this process. Similar is the process of the evolution of consciousness at the animal as well as at the human stage. At the animal stage consciousness expresses itself in the form of living organisms and to the extent it is able to express itself in them and is represented by conscious creatures on earth, it makes use of those creatures, that is, of its own powers expressed or manifested in those creatures, to serve its purpose of future evolution. To the extent the creature serves this purpose, its efforts favour the potentialities of consciousness and coincide with its unseen efforts. To that extent, therefore, the creature progresses and evolves and thereby draws into itself and manifests in itself the hidden powers of consciousness. To the extent the creature's efforts run counter to the potentialities of consciousness or to its secret purpose, it is unable to progress and evolve and is, therefore, left to perish gradually. The efforts of the creature only bring the latent urge of consciousness into play more and more so that the creature can evolve only in a direction which is consistent with the potentialities of consciousness.

In the human stage of evolution too, as the self-consciousness of a man develops, consciousness expresses itself in him more and more. To the extent consciousness has not yet been able to express itself in man it depends upon its own hidden powers to push on the process of evolution. But to the extent to which it expresses itself in the growing self-consciousness of man, it makes use of him, that is, of its own powers expressed in him to serve its

purpose of future evolution. A man is able to serve this purpose to the extent to which he is self-conscious and to the extent to which he serves it, his efforts favour the potentialities or the purpose of consciousness and coincide with its unseen efforts. To that extent, therefore, he is able to evolve and make further additions to his self-consciousness. But to the extent he is unable to serve this purpose, he is unable to progress and evolve; he is acting immorally and his efforts run counter to the purpose of the Creator and to the potentialities of consciousness.

When a man reaches the highest stage of his self-consciousness, consciousness expresses itself in him to such an extent that a part of its hidden powers becomes manifest in him. This stage is achieved generally during the time of prayers or contemplation, for a short period of time but has a tendency to recur as often as one makes an effort. Just as in the case of the Divine-Self, to think or to desire is to create, similarly in the case of a human self that has reached the highest stage of self-consciousness, that is, a stage where a man is able to share the purpose of the Creator consciously, to think or to desire is to create. This accounts for the miracles of Christ and other prophets as also for the efficacy of the prayers of those men who have attained to the highest degree of self-consciousness. At this stage man becomes perfectly free. He outgrows the limitations of fate and determinism and whatever he desires comes to pass. But the desires of a self-conscious man are different from the desires of ordinary human beings.

We should not look upon praying as a curious, awkward or unfashionable sort of activity. It is an activity of the highest order since it is the search for Beauty. The activity of a scientist engaged in the search of truth is directed to the same end is essentially of the same nature. The only difference between the worshipper and the scientist is that while the former comes into contact with the Reality as a whole, the latter sees only a fraction of it. Pray-

ing must be looked upon rather as an indication of culture and a mark of civilization. The act of a man busy with his prayers is fundamentally of the same character as that of a man studying a beautiful picture. Only in the former case, since the act involves the contemplation of Ideal Beauty, the pleasure is capable of increasing to the highest point, while in the latter case it has a limit which is reached very soon. But this is true only of the highest form of prayer which is an expression of a genuine feeling of Beauty and which is not merely a sort of begging.

It is well known that the appreciation of beauty in a concrete object, *e.g.*, a picture, is an active process which itself contributes to the nature and intensity of the experience. This accounts for the great differences in the appreciation of the beauty of an object by the same person at different times or by different persons at the same time. When this activity of consciousness is directed towards understanding the source of beauty itself, it is known as prayer. You can increase your feeling of the Beauty of Consciousness or your love of Ideal Beauty by regular prayers just as you can intensify your appreciation of the beauty of a picture by contemplation. What you appreciate in a picture is not the physical object made up of the colour or canvas but the meaning behind it which is the total impression of beauty that the artist has achieved. The nearer you approach to this impression the greater is your appreciation of beauty. The meaning in the case of prayer is represented not by line or colour but by the words which express the attributes of Beauty. The appreciation of beauty through the symbols of words should not be a less interesting affair than its appreciation through the symbols of line, curve or colour.

The attitude of submission or self-negation is a necessary part of the act of worship, but even this is not peculiar to worship. The contemplation of beauty always involves an attitude of submission which is an automatic result of

the attraction of the beautiful object and the desire to approach it or seek a closer contact with it. This attitude is easily discernible in our contemplation of the beauty of a picture.

In the case of prayer the attitude of submission or self-negation is amply rewarded by a sense of completeness, pride, power and confidence which is a direct result of it.

The *Fourth Stage* in the development of self-consciousness begins at the death of the physical body. The self is immortal. It cannot die because it is the only reality in the Universe. It is the self that creates the body and not the body that creates the self. The self incarnates itself in matter in order to find a scope for struggle which is its life. When it has conquered matter and achieved the maximum of its progress which it could have achieved by means of opposing matter, it no longer requires a body for its future progress. It becomes independent of the body just as at one time it became independent of a new species for its future development. There was a time in its evolution when it freed itself from the limitations of physical laws and appeared in the form of a living autonomous cell. In the next stage it freed itself from the compulsion of instincts. Finally it may free itself entirely from matter and yet continue to progress. Death marks the beginning of a new stage, only one in millions of stages, in the career of life. It has passed through innumerable such stages in the past from the beginning of creation till the present times.

The self has ever gone on and on and there is no reason to think that it will stop its forward march at what is known as death. To do so will be contrary to its nature, as we have known it so far. And why should it stop? Much remains to be achieved yet. The beauty that it was seeking all along is unlimited. It may have enriched itself much with that beauty no doubt but it can continue to enrich itself with it more and more for ever. The self, however much it may have progressed in the

world, has not yet reached the maximum of its own consciousness. It can assimilate more of light yet.

The progress achieved by the self in the third stage assures its smooth progress in the fourth stage. This smooth progress is the joy of Paradise. It is a continuation of that joy, due to a sense of completeness, which the devoted self was able to achieve in this world; only it is far superior to it. It is continuous and grows automatically and without suffering. There are two Heavens, one in this world and the other in the next and the Heaven of the next world is a continuation of the Heaven of this world. The self in this stage will get all that it wants and we know that it will not want any thing more than what it has ever wanted, that is, an ever-increasing intimacy with Beauty, a new glimpse of it every time, leading to an ever greater and greater sense of its own completeness and happiness. This will include all that it will desire. The self that has achieved this joy in the world knows that it can never go. Since the self is immortal, love, its function, is also immortal. Paradise is love having a smooth way.

All human selves live here and hereafter but all of them do not live equally. Life and death are relative terms. There is nothing that is absolutely dead and there is nothing that is absolutely alive except the Divine Self. Absolute life belongs only to the Source of Consciousness. We live only in proportion as we are near to this Source. The higher our stage of evolution, the nearer we are to the Source of Consciousness and therefore to the quality of immortality. We live in this world as well as in the next in proportion to our self-consciousness. The stones are less alive than animals and the animals are less alive then men and among men too there are varying stages of life. The prophets, the saints and other highly self-conscious men are the only persons really and fully alive. Death of the physical body makes no difference to the lives of such persons. They live beyond death. They have a new

glimpse of Beauty, that is to say, a new addition to their life every moment. Their self-consciousness continues to progress indefinitely and automatically without struggle or pain because they have no obstacles to conquer. Fear and grief which are the result of obstacles in the way of love, do not exist for them. It is this state of bliss which we call Paradise. Hell on the other hand is the name of those battles of the self with its obstacles which continue beyond death.

Chapter V

ETHICS

The whole problem of Ethics becomes easy when we realize that it is the ideal that creates the distinction between right and wrong. An individual knows that he must do certain things and avoid doing certain things in order to achieve his ideal. Some actions are wrong and some right with respect to every ideal and therefore every ideal prescribes its own ethical code or law.

There are as many systems of morality as there are ideals and each system must be considered as correct relatively to the ideal of which it is the product. The moral systems of Machiavelli and Lenin which we dislike are really demanded by the ideals of these philosophers—the state in the case of one and Communism in the case of the other. Because their ideals are wrong the moral systems resulting from them are also wrong. Since there is one ideal that is right there is one ethical system that is right. The law of the Right Ideal is the Right Ethical Law and all other ethical laws are wrong.

Whether an ideal is right or wrong its law is followed by a person willingly, and easily on account of the force of the ideal's love and the greater his love for the ideal the easier it is for him to act morally in relation to it. Moral action requires an effort of the will only when another impulse is competing with the ideal and absorbing a portion of the self's love. A person who is swayed by an intense love for an ideal feels an irresistible impulse to act morally in relation to that ideal. The moral law of a wrong ideal has no permanent value since the ideal on which it is based is itself transitory. While every other

code of morality is followed only for the sake of the ideal that creates it, the law of the Right Ideal is followed not only for the sake of the ideal but also for its own sake, since, unlike all other moral systems, it is a part of the urge of self and when obeyed gives satisfaction by itself. It is a part of our nature. It is based on the attributes of self. Because self is Beauty all attributes that are attractive to us or that we love and admire at our best, are the attributes of self. They can be described by one word, Beauty. All actions to which these attributes apply, according to the judgment of the acting self, are moral and the reverse are immoral. These attributes belong to the World-Self in their perfection and to the human self to the extent to which they can be revealed through the growth of self-consciousness.

The moral law of the Right Ideal, being the law of self, is the deepest nature and the innermost desire of human consciousness. It appeals to our nature, has a permanent value and, therefore, it alone deserves the name of the Moral Law. Since it is determined by the nature of self, it has nothing to do with the utilitarian, biological, empirical, socialistic or other external, artificial or materialistic standards of morality. Every other system of morality besides it has its source in one of the wrong ideals, comes into conflict with our nature and fails to give us the fullest satisfaction although we may continue to follow it even willingly for the sake of the ideal we may have set before us.

When a person having a wrong ideal wants to follow the Moral Law it is very difficult for him to do so in spite of the fact that there is in his nature an urge pressing him towards it. The reason is that the love of the wrong ideal interferes with and perverts his moral judgments so that his effort to act morally does no more than produce an action which is required by the wrong ideal, although he must persuade himself as well as others to believe that it is perfectly moral. The love of the wrong ideal that

sways him exposes him to an error of judgment. He misinterprets the Moral Law under its influence whether he knows it or not. If we assume that good character depends upon the observance of the Law of the Right Ideal then it is impossible to expect a really good character from a man who is devoid of a strong love for his Creator. In the case of such a man there is always some other love impairing the validity of his moral judgments and undermining the nobility of his character, although he is generally unconscious of this fact. This explains why persons having different ideals give different meanings to justice and morality and become ready to take up arms against each other sincerely in the name of justice or morality. A person following a wrong law cannot derive full moral satisfaction from his actions because his moral actions are determined by his wrong love and come into conflict with the urge of his nature. He is immoral although the society may declare him to be innocent and may even praise him for his actions, because he is not obeying the law within.

Only that person whose ideal is the Right Ideal is free to act morally. Every other person is led away from the path of morality, whether he means it or not, by the force of his wrong love. Even in the case of the Right Ideal the moral judgments of different persons may vary because all may not have an equal realization of the ideal's beauty. Correct moral judgments are possible only at a high stage of the development of self-consciousness. At lower stages of self-consciousness the moral judgments of persons are marred by impulses which still remain unconquered.

The extent to which the moral judgment of a person may be right depends upon the strength of his love for the Right Ideal or, which comes to the same thing, upon the strength of the impulses which interfere with the impulse for the Right Ideal. If our love of the Right Ideal is strong enough to defeat all other impulses then our moral judgments will be correct. Also, in this case, it will be easier to act upto those judgments. As long as our love for the

Right Ideal remains weak other impulses besides those of the ideal must continue to influence our judgments and impair their validity.

A strict adherence to the moral code is an essential condition of any progress of self-consciousness by means of worship in the manner outlined in the previous chapter. The reason is that the self evolves by the continuous growth and constant strengthening of love and love grows and gains in strength by expression in all possible ways. To express it only in worship at certain hours of the day or night and not in our actions which occupy the greater portion of our time is a case of mutual contradiction. In so far as our actions in our daily life are not being determined by the love of the Right Ideal, they are surely being determined by the love of a wrong ideal, which is having expression and therefore growing and gaining in strength at the expense of the Right Love. Thus in the absence of moral action, worship must have the opposite result. A man who offers regular prayers but does not submit to strict ethical discipline is like a man who travels for two hours in one direction and for ten hours in the opposite direction. He must ever recede farther and farther from his destination. Only that person can maintain and add to the benefit derived from regular prayers in the form of a growing self-consciousness who leads a strictly moral life. Like worship, moral action is an expression of love as well as a means of its growth. Both worship and moral action are aspects or forms of love. They are methods of seeking beauty. Each one of these two forms of love supports the other. A man who loves his Creator must love His qualities and therefore he will not only worship Him but also express His qualities in action. In other words, he will lead a moral life.

Wrong impulses continue to exist side by side with the impulse for the Right Ideal always. In the earlier stages of the growth of self-consciousness they are very powerful and often compete successfully with the impulse for the

Right Ideal. Therefore even a sincere and devoted worshipper finds it difficult to submit himself to a strict moral discipline in the beginning. But even a small amount of initial success which the self is able to achieve in its moral efforts adds immensely to the benefit it would have derived from mere worship; it raises the level of its self-consciousness and thereby makes further moral effort easier. As the self gains in self-consciousness by the mutual support and cooperation of worship and moral action in this way, moral action becomes ever easier and easier for it, till when the highest stage of self-consciousness is reached it finds that its impulse for moral action has become irresistible. Worship and moral action going hand in hand lead to an ever greater and greater evolution of the self. Very soon in the course of its progress the self attains to a personal experience that the Moral Law is not an imposition from outside but it is the desire of its own real nature. At this stage the self regains itself completely; its qualities are unveiled and begin to shine in their full splendour. At this stage the self does not obey the moral law but the moral law obeys the self, that is, whatever the self does out of its own most cherished and irresistible desire is perfectly in accordance with the Moral Law. This is the state of that perfect liberation and highest evolution of the self which it is possible for it to achieve in its individual capacity. But the worship or the moral action of the self does not stop here. The self needs to maintain the state of its highest evolution by continued worship and constant moral action. The light that it has kindled within must be protected so that it may spread to the rest of humanity and thereby gain further in brilliance itself. *Moral action may be defined briefly as action which is intended to help evolution in the individual and the society directly and consciously.*

A mere idea is not an ideal. An ideal is that idea which commands the greatest amount of the self's love. Many of us have a definite idea of a Creator but it is rarely

our ideal. The idea of a Creator is raised to the position of an ideal only when it has succeeded in attaching to itself more of the love of the self than any other idea is having. This difficult task is accomplished by means of worship and moral action going hand in hand. The task is difficult because long before we can have any clear idea of a Creator we have already attached ourselves to many wrong ideals and followed their laws long enough to develop wrong habits of action. Thus the self's love is occupied and is no longer available for the Right Ideal. Wrong Ideals hold the field, having established themselves firmly on wrong habits of action which serve them continuously. If, in this state, the self were to abandon all wrong ideals at once, it would get suddenly a fuller view of the beauty of the Right Ideal. Its love would take a sudden leap which will facilitate its progress for the future. This does happen sometimes in the case of a great misfortune when it appears to a man that all his companions have deserted him and, in his despair, he returns to his Creator for help and consolation. But generally the process of the growth of true love is gradual. It grows by encroaching slowly upon the existing wrong loves and strengthens itself gradually at their expense. As the true love develops by persistent worship and moral effort in the manner described above it gains in power and the wrong loves and the habits formed under their influence are gradually weakened and worn out and ultimately eradicated. A love, whether right or wrong, is not one love but a system of loves. Whatever object helps a love becomes an object of love itself.

The force of habit is very great. Wrong habits continue to operate in spite of us and interfere with the development of right habits consistent with the Right Ideal. Bad habits cannot be counteracted by suppressing them. There is only one way in which we can get rid of them and that is by fostering good habits. In this way they are thrown into disuse and die out, of their own accord. That

explains why religion which sets an ideal before us also prescribes a form or a system of regular ceremonies with which many people identify the essence of religion itself. The form is intended to inculcate a set of habits consistent with the law of the Right Ideal. From one point of view it is a means to an end. It protects the spirit of religion (which is the love of the Right Ideal) by not only eradicating habits inconsistent with it but also by making their future growth impossible. It helps to concentrate our attention on the ideal every moment of our life owing to the strict discipline imposed by it. From another point of view it is not only a means to an end but also an end in itself since it is based on that law which is a part of the urge of self and strict obedience to it facilitates the growth of self-consciousness as we shall have occasion to note further on.

The moral law or the law of the Right Ideal is the deepest nature and the innermost desire of man. It is the road along which nature means evolution to proceed. It is the path along which we can get freedom and progress. We are never acting freely and usefully unless we are acting morally. Moral action is life enjoying freedom and seeking more freedom. Morality is the light of the world. It is the torch that lights the only road leading to progress and prosperity. Without it we are lost in darkness, groping for our path without finding it, colliding with serious obstacles and risking our life and safety itself. If we neglect it individually or collectively we can do so at our own cost, at the price of stagnating and perishing.

Immorality is the morality prescribed by wrong ideals. It is due in very many cases to the disproportionate importance we attach to the desires of the instincts which rise in the form of one ideal or another disguised and even spiritualized and sanctified by erroneous judgments of the self. The desires of the instincts are not directly our own desires. They are the desires of the animal in us and we have to use them as means to achieve our own ends as

human beings. We have evolved in our present form in order to rule and enslave them and give them their proper place and not in order to be ruled or enslaved by them. If they have the better of us we lose our freedom, stagnate and cease to progress and evolve and above all run the risk of perishing. The history of evolution is a proof of the fact that life has no use for that part of it which does not evolve. It discards it and leaves it to perish. It is true that on the whole life is ultimately going to win in spite of all our errors but, on our own part, we shall deserve miseries and extinction if we do not join as helpful servants in the aspirations of life. Life which does not grow is face to face with death. We can escape stagnation and death by living and living is only moral living. Every other way of life is merely a struggle with death in which we can win only by coming back to the moral path as soon as possible. We may prolong the struggle by persisting in the path of immorality or else cut it short by taking refuge with morality, but if we choose the former alternative we should know the consequences involved.

Those of us who want to rebel against the Moral Law in order to be happy, end by being miserable. We cannot break the Moral Law with impunity. The reason is that it is not an external imposition of a cruel society or a conventional religion. It is an internal pressing demand of our nature. It is a biological necessity of a higher order. It is written, not on the tablets of stone, but on the tablets of the hearts. The functions of self no less than the functions of the body are subject to immutable laws of nature. To maintain the fitness, the completeness and the growth of the body is the natural urge of the organism. When we satisfy it, the result is *health*. To maintain the fitness, the completeness and the growth of self is the natural urge of consciousness. When we satisfy it the result is *happiness*. The rules of health are not easier to observe than the rules of happiness but we strictly follow the former and lightly treat the latter. The reason is that while we have under-

stood the former we have not yet understood the latter. Nature, however, accepts no plea of ignorance while enforcing its punishments.

It is a characteristic of moral action that it is due to a free, unrestrained choice or judgment of the self. The self has to make its own judgments of the attributes of Beauty at every occasion. It cannot borrow the judgments of others. The higher the stage of its self-consciousness the greater the validity of its moral judgments. No objective standard of morality is possible or serviceable because it is consciousness alone that can know its own law. Since moral action is free action, to have an outside standard whether it is biological, religious, social or utilitarian is to enslave the self and to stop its evolution. Restraint is the negation of freedom and therefore of morality. All activity of the self is free activity. Moral action will not satisfy the urge of self, in fact it will not be moral at all, if it is not the result of free choice. Moral action is inseparable from intention which indicates the actual direction of the moral effort of the self. No action is moral without the intention to make it moral. An apparently moral action devoid of good intentions is immoral and conversely an apparently immoral action caused by really right intentions is moral.

The moral judgments of people are sometimes in extreme conflict. In the recent world-war all parties seemed to be sincerely fighting for justice. The cause of such errors is that we expect ourselves to behave morally without possessing a strong love of the Right Ideal from which alone the Moral Law is derived. In the absence of the Right Ideal a person is bound to have a wrong ideal, and however much he may try to be moral the influence of his wrong love must continually mar the validity of his moral judgments. His justice comes to have a different meaning in spite of his efforts. It is not the justice demanded by the Right Ideal but a different kind of justice which is required by his wrong love. There are as many

varieties of justice as there are ideals wrong or right. It is difficult to convince a person who loves a wrong ideal that his justice is not justice. He has always a number of arguments in support of his moral decisions although deep down in his heart there lurks a dissatisfaction with them which he succeeds in suppressing partially or completely for some time. But although such a dissatisfaction may be suppressed completely for some time, it cannot be removed entirely. It must make its appearance sooner or later. Our moral decisions are determined by our loves and hates, by our ideals and not by reason. In order to overcome our wrong loves and wrong desires and to enable the self to make valid moral judgments it is necessary to develop a strong love for the Right Ideal. Only a person possessing a high degree of sell-consciousness can behave morally. In case the self is in the earlier stages of its growth, many desires and impulses which are not its own will interfere with its moral judgments and impair their correctness. If on the other hand it has attained to a high standard of self-consciousness its moral desire will be strong enough to know itself and to free itself from other desires which will not rule it, but which, on the other hand, it will be able to rule powerfully. Its judgments will be correct.

Here we come across a difficulty. There can be no morality without a high degree of self-consciousness and a high degree of self-consciousness cannot be achieved without a strict moral life. How can we break this circle? If nature wants to help evolution it must certainly provide a solution for this difficulty and it does provide it in the form of that highly misunderstood phenomenon which is known as prophethood. A prophet is a rare personality who rises to a high degree of self-consciousness by a special favour of nature and is able to know and teach mankind the law of self. If we follow him faithfully and strictly we too can acquire a high standard of self-consciousness along with a first hand knowledge of the distinction between right and wrong. This looks like submitting to an objec-

tive and external standard of morality. But really the standard of morality prescribed by the prophet is not external to the self. It conforms to the innermost desire of our nature. It is our own standard which we love to follow of our own free choice in the long run. No doubt, we but vaguely understand this inner desire in the beginning and submit to the prophet's code with a feeling of compulsion and restraint but this feeling is only temporary. When obedience to the prophet has enabled us to advance sufficiently in our self-consciousness we discover the meaning of the ethical code or the moral law on which it is based. The inner urge of our nature comes into its own and begins to press itself, so that we no longer follow the moral law under a feeling of restraint but as our own most cherished desire and as a source of joy and pleasure. As long as the follower of a prophet does not reach a stage of development where his moral actions become not only free from all sense of compulsion or restriction but where they also appear to result from an irresistible desire in this way, he remains very low in the scale of self-consciousness and his moral actions cannot be strictly designated as moral. Moral action is a free activity of the self.

It remains to be considered how far reason can help us in our moral judgments. Owing to the teachings of Aristotle we have been making too much of reason so far. Aristotle was enamoured of the excellence of human rationality and believed that the exercise of reason was the highest good which man could indulge in. He worked out a system of Ethics based on reason, which was a sort of a rationalized mean between extremes. But his rational code laid down that some men should be subjected to slavery in order that some others may be able to exercise their reason. When the reasoning powers of Aristotle, the worshipper of reason, could not guide him to see that it was wrong to treat a part of humanity as cattle, whose reason can we depend upon to make a correct distinction between right and wrong? In modern times Hitler also

believed in the slavery of some men in order to make possible for the superior German race to apply themselves to scientific research. The ideal of Aristotle was reason and the ideal of Hitler was the German race. Both had wrong ideals and therefore the judgments of both were incorrect. True Love alone is the source of all knowledge of right and wrong.

Man is a creature of impulse and reason is a servant of impulses. Whenever we act, we act under the influence of the impulse that happens to be the strongest at the time and reason helps this impulse to satisfy itself by action. Moral action has its source in the impulse for Beauty or the impulse for the Right Ideal. If the impulse for the ideal is rightly directed reason will serve us rightly otherwise it will serve us wrongly. In order to make correct moral judgments, we need, as mentioned already, to strengthen the impulse or the love for the Right-Ideal. What is known as the victory of reason over impulse is really the victory of one impulse over another. Reason itself never seeks to conquer our impulses. It prefers always to serve them and never to be ruled by them. Reason is not an urge for action, although it may awaken, guide or direct an urge. Reason in itself fails to create an obligation although the arguments may be very convincing.

According to Mc Dougall the "instincts are the bases from which the character and will of individuals and nations gradually develop *under the guidance of the intellectual faculties.*"

On our view the will and character of persons have their source in the urge of self for the ideals which is separate from the urge of instincts and rules the instincts. The strength of will or character of an individual is in proportion to his ability to oppose, dominate and rule the instinctive impulses for the sake of the ideal. An ideal is not a magical transformation of instincts achieved 'under the guidance of the intellectual faculties' but it is due to our direct judgment of beauty as a result of the self's function of loving. Instincts perform in man no more than a biolo-

gical function as they do in the animal. Reason is no doubt an additional qualification of man which the animal does not possess but the higher activities of man which are peculiar to him are not caused by reason guiding his instinctive impulses. Reason guides our instinctive impulses to their ends but it cannot create new impulses nor can it modify, improve or change the nature of the existing ones. It is the servant of impulses and not their master. Man has another additional qualification besides reason which alone is the source of his will, character or ethical behaviour and it is the impulse for the ideal. It is higher and stronger than the instinctive impulses and rules them. It is not the creation of reason but has its own independent existence. All impulses including the impulse for the ideal require the help of reason to guide them to their ends but this guidance cannot transform our lower instinctive impulses into higher ones.

An ideal is a direct judgment of Beauty. This judgment is the function of self as a whole. It is accomplished by means of feeling, intuition, faith or direct vision. In what way then does reason guide the impulse for the ideal? It guides this impulse by stimulating its direct vision of Beauty to some extent. Reason examines the parts of objects and ideas and the self takes help from reason in this sense that as parts of new wholes come to light, the self makes new judgments of wholes. Thus reason gives a direction to the urge for the ideal to some extent. But if the self should stick only to the part revealed by reason, it will never know the whole which it needs so much to know. The self cannot afford to follow reason too closely as the information of reason is too insufficient for its purpose. Our ideal is never a rationally understood reality. Rationality sees only a part of it while the whole is seen by intuition or direct vision.

The self may be compared to a man with bandaged eyes left to grope his way towards a particular room in a big house already familiar to him to some extent. As he

feels with his hands the walls, the doors, the enclosures of passages and other such marks in the course of his walk, he can picture to himself completely the part of the house he has reached at any time. His hands enable him to see only a part of his surroundings, that part which he actually embraces in darkness but the complete guidance is supplied to him by his imagination which recalls the full picture of every part of the house that he visits. Reason is to us like the groping hands of the man revealing to him only certain marks of his passage and intuition, feeling or faith like his imagination by means of which he is able to picture the whole of his surroundings. Just as the cause of the bandaged man's helpful imagination is his previous familiarity with the house, so the cause of our intuition or direct judgment is our innate desire for beauty.

The function of reason is to dissect and analyse into parts. Beauty can be felt and appreciated as a whole but cannot be analysed into its constituents; it has no constituents; it is a single indivisible whole. Reason examines only the parts of the whole that we feel, appreciate or apprehend by direct vision but it cannot grasp the whole which is always more than the sum total of its parts examined by reason. Reason helps us to improve our idea of beauty because it reveals parts of new wholes and thus enables us to intuit or vision new wholes. What we feel, love, praise or admire is always much more than what we can prove by reason i.e. *mathematically*.

This view is supported by a recent development of psychology known as the gestalt or the configuration psychology. The gestalt school of psychology emphasises the point that the human mind is concerned with knowing 'wholes' or 'totalities' which can be known only by 'intuition' or 'direct vision'.

The question is sometimes asked which of the three faculties of man—will, intuition and reason—is more important than the others? Will at the human level of life is no other than the urge for an ideal. Intuition is the light by

which this urge is able to see its object as a whole. Reason is a faculty which serves intuition by guiding it to some of the parts of the whole that is needed by it. Intuition and reason are both parts of will and not apart from will. Will at the human stage of evolution is gifted with a quality of intuition which can appreciate the beauty of an idea which is always a whole and with a quality of reason which can serve intuition in the efficient performance of this function.

Reason helps intuition to grasp a whole, while it discerns only a part of this whole itself. It acts as a servant of intuition always, whether it is rationalizing the impulse for the ideal (which it does quite sincerely) or whether it is assisting this impulse to reach its end or whether it is guiding it towards a higher beauty or a higher ideal. The cause of our intuition which looks around for wholes is our innate desire for Beauty, which is a whole and which can be only felt or intuited. This desire attracts us towards and impels us to strive for the achievement or realization of an object or an idea that is a whole or completes a whole and repels us from an object or an idea that is not a whole or does not fit into or does not complete a whole. The whole towards which we are attracted derives its wholeness or beauty from our desire for beauty, or from our ideal. In the animal the desire for Beauty is fixed and automatic and takes the form of instincts. Our attraction for a whole is accompanied by an effort. The effort is directed *to bridge the gap* between the situation as it is and the situation as it should be which constitutes a pattern or a whole created by our love for the ideal and its requirements. That is why what is a 'whole' to one man is not a 'whole' to another man who has a different ideal or to the same man under a different set of circumstances suggesting different requirements of the ideal. Thus the same object may be hated by us under one set of circumstances and may be loved by us under different circumstances. As a matter of fact when the circumstances change the object is also changed, because the meaning

that we give to it is no longer the same. Whenever objects and ideas acquire a halo of beauty they do so from our changing ideals or from our innate desire for beauty interpreted to the best of our knowledge from time to time. It is the beauty of the ideal that is reflected in the object or the idea we love or admire as the light of the sun is reflected in the moon. Nothing however is really beautiful or lovable except the Right Ideal. Wrong Ideals appear beautiful to us because we mistake them for it.

Reason can give us no knowledge without feeling. We know only what we feel. All knowledge is the knowledge of self. Therefore all knowledge is of the nature of feeling or emotion. We know objects and ideas other than the self in order to know the self in relation to them. Since the knowledge of self is the knowledge of Beauty it can only take the form of a feeling or an emotion. Even the statement two plus two is equal to four is a feeling. This statement is a truth, a harmony or a beauty which we can only feel. We know it as a truth only when we are able to contemplate or feel its harmony or beauty as a whole. This contemplation or feeling is itself outside the scope of reason although reason may guide us to it. All mathematical or scientific knowledge is a series of such felt harmonies or beauties. If a piece of knowledge as a whole may be measured by the number one hundred, then even if reason enables us to see ninety eight parts of it, it must leave out 2 parts to be supplied by feeling, to complete the whole that we are able to call knowledge. The remaining two parts are extremely important because without them the activity of reason would be useless and would bring us no knowledge whatsoever. The reason is that the word knowledge is to be used for something that can be represented by the number one hundred and not for what may be represented by the number ninety eight. What reason leaves to feeling or rather what feeling takes from reason is sometimes more and sometimes less. In the case of Mathematics and the exact

sciences feeling takes a lot from reason. In the case of philosophy and speculative sciences reason does not come so close to feeling although it gives a spur or a push to it or attempts to justify it. In the case of art, feeling is left almost entirely to itself.

Most of our knowledge of men and things which is the basis of our actions and which is of a vital importance to us in our daily life is anything but mathematical or scientific. It is based on direct vision or intuition. It is a kind of knowledge in which feeling plays the principal role. It is impossible for a man who insists on mathematical or scientific knowledge in every thing, to live on this earth for a single moment. In the case of knowledge that is based on feeling mainly, we may require a lengthy and difficult process of reasoning for one man and a very short and simple one for another in order to convince each of the same truth. The reasons that suffice for one man in proof of the same reality may not suffice for another man who may go on doubting it. This is so because knowledge is settled by feeling or sensitiveness and not by reason. A man who is gifted with a good deal of sensitiveness or the faculty of direct vision may believe in a truth even if reason proves ten per cent of it and a man who lacks the faculty of direct vision or sensitiveness may not believe the same truth even if reason proves ninety per cent of it.

While reason can give us no knowledge without the final judgement of feeling, feeling may give us knowledge without calling in the aid of reason. There are occasions when we acquire knowledge with the help of feeling alone and make no use of reason whatsoever, for example, when we know a picture or a symphony to be admirable and beautiful without arguing or proving its beauty.

Every whole is discovered by the searching activity of feeling spurred and guided by reason and after the discovery is made what we remember as the basis of action or further reasoning is feeling and not the reasoning that brought it about. *When we are reasoning we are dealing*

with the relations of wholes in order to discover a bigger whole in which these wholes appear as parts. The bigger wholes discovered in this way may be dealt with by reason at a future occasion from the point of view of their relation within another still bigger whole and so on.

When we act, we act under the influence of the impulse that appears to us to be the strongest. Reason discovers this impulse and its end and serves it to reach this end.

Supposing there is a man who is compelled by hunger to steal some bread which happens to be within reach. He will reason in order to find out whether he will not be discovered and beaten. If his detection is likely and he thinks he can wait for food for a little while more, the impulse of fear will be stronger than the impulse for food. If he is extremely hungry he will argue and convince himself that he will not be detected. His reason will be under the influence of his stronger impulse. Our reason justifies the things that we want to do. When our desire to do something is very strong we reason out things so as to justify our action. Even a man who is very intelligent and learned will commit an error in such a case. His error will be due not to a weak reasoning power or lack of intelligence or knowledge but to the strength of his wrong desire. On the other hand when a wrong desire is comparatively weak a less intelligent or less educated man will be able to control it. We cannot say therefore that one man—the former—behaved unintelligently and the other—the latter—acted intelligently. Each man obeyed his stronger impulse. It is a different matter that the stronger desire was right in the case of one and wrong in the case of the other.

In the above example there is a conflict between two instinctive desires, the desire for food and the desire to escape punishment. In this conflict the stronger instinctive desire defeated the weaker one and had it way. But we must not forget that in any case the conquering desire which determines the action actually is ultimately domi-

nated by the impulse for the ideal. To say that one instinctive desire may be stronger than the other has no meaning in the case of man. Ultimately the strength of every instinctive desire in the human being is fixed by the desire for the ideal. In the above case the instinct of escape seems to be stronger than that of hunger, because the ideal permits it to be as strong as it is. But sometimes the ideal may reduce the strength of this impulse so much that a soldier intoxicated with the love of his country may stand firm in the battle-field in the midst of exploding shells in order to defend his country.

No instinctive impulse can have its way unless it has the sanction or the cooperation of the impulse for the ideal. Every such impulse is satisfied to the extent to which the ideal wants it. When the ideal appears to have been defeated by a desire of the instinct it is due to the fact that the avowed ideal of a person ceases to be his ideal for some time *i.e.*, it fails to attract a sufficient amount of the self's love and the urge for the ideal finds an outlet in the instinctive desire itself. But an instinctive impulse satisfied at the expense of a weak ideal of perfection makes a man miserable afterwards. The reason is that the attraction of the instinctive desire and the satisfaction derived from it are not permanent and a man very soon begins to feel that he has obstructed the satisfaction of his desire for Beauty by satisfying his instinctive impulse. He feels inferior and guilty because that which according to him was conducive to happiness has not been achieved. Such slips can be avoided by strengthening the love for the ideal but we cannot strengthen this love unless the ideal is really worthy of love. Any doubt about its beauty or perfection would make love an impossibility. The ideal should lose no battle because every victory gained by it makes it stronger and capable of winning more victories and every defeat suffered by it makes it weaker and prone to be defeated again. Every battle lost by the Right Ideal is a battle won by a wrong ideal; it helps a wrong love at the expense of

the Right Love. That we feel miserable after our ideal of perfection has lost an inner battle is a proof that the desire for perfection is a part of our nature.

In the above example, supposing the man finds that there is absolutely no chance of his being detected or beaten and yet he refuses to satisfy his hunger by stealing because he thinks it is unbecoming of him to steel bread. He prefers to die rather than steal. Here we see more clearly than in the previous case the urge for the ideal controlling and dominating the urge of instincts. In this case, since the ideal does not accord sanction to the urge of the instinct, the latter cannot have its way. When the ideal impulse is stronger than the instinctive impulse it can have its own way easily. The impulse to run away in face of danger will be overcome by a person who has a higher ideal than the mere protection of his life, at a time when his ideal will require him to overcome it. This we have seen in the example of a soldier who sticks to his post in the battle-field in spite of immediate danger to his life. If he runs away from the battle-field it will be due to the fact that the impulse for the ideal in his case has found expression in the desire to save his life or which is the same thing, the desire for the ideal has lost a share of the self's love to the benefit of the desire to live, making the latter far stronger than the former. The impulse for the ideal has changed its object. A person's ideal at any time is that idea which attracts him more than all other ideas at that time. Thus it is ultimately the urge for the ideal that reason serves and justifies.

The modification of an instinctive impulse whenever it occurs in the human being is due to the impulse for the ideal.

When a person is angry his first impulse is to express his anger in a crude form, to abuse or even to beat the person causing the anger. But if he is a cultured man, on thinking and reasoning, his first impulse is modified and the person expresses his anger by means of say, a mild

suggestive remark which he considers sufficient for his purpose. It appears to us as if the modification has been caused by reason but as a matter of fact it is the impulse for the ideal that has modified it. The person wants to behave as a respectable and civilised man. He has a certain standard of behaviour which is a part of his ideal. Reason has simply helped the impulse for the ideal to see its way, so that it was able to assert itself over the instinct of pugnacity and modify its expression. When a hungry man does not beg or steal but strives to earn his bread by honourable means it is not on account of reason but on account of the fact that he has a certain ideal which checks and makes impossible in his case a low manner of satisfying his instinct for food. Reason serves his impulse for the ideal and enables it to see that stealing or begging cannot satisfy it. Another person whose ideal is lower than that of this man will not mind stealing or begging and reason would serve him to see how best he can beg or steal. It is the urge of self therefore that modifies the urge of instinct and not reason as McDougall has imagined. Reason serves and justifies the strongest impulse in us and that impulse is the impulse for the ideal, whatever object the ideal may be or whatever the idea in which the impulse for the ideal may be having an expression.

When the impulse for the ideal is rightly directed we act rightly and our reasoning is right. When it is wrongly directed we act wrongly and our reasoning is wrong.

In order to act rightly we need to direct our impulse for the ideal to the Right Ideal and to strengthen it as much as possible. Moral judgments are judgments of beauty. The Beautiful is the Good as Plato rightly believes. These judgments have their source in the love of the Right Ideal; the stronger our love for it the more valid our judgments.

The automatism or the compulsion of instincts serves a very useful purpose by forcing the attention of the self to the business of maintaining the body and sparing it from the task of deciding and choosing at the proper time to act

with a view to satisfy the needs of the body. The instinct, by functioning as an automatic signal of danger to the body, calls attention of the urge of self to a duty which is its own, and when the signal is once given it remains for the self to see upto what extent it should respond to it so as to leave a perfectly free passage for itself, that is, whether its duty, consistent with its own expression is to satisfy the whole demand of the instinct or a part of it or nothing of it, or whether it should satisfy it more than the instinct really *i.e.*, biologically demands. In the last case the instinctive desire itself becomes the ideal of the self.

But although the compulsion of instincts is extremely useful, generally, it is nevertheless a disadvantage in this respect that on account of it our instinctive desires are strong rivals of our ideals (of course when the instinctive desire itself is not the ideal) in the initial stage of the development of the ideal's love and the urge of self has to struggle very hard for its own expression. But as the love of the ideal develops the impulses of instincts become weaker and weaker as compared with it and the ideal is able to assert itself more and more easily. It is extremely necessary therefore that we try to increase our love for the ideal to such an extent that no instinctive desire is able to compete with it in spite of its natural advantage. If we fail to do so the result will be that when the critical moment of the ideal's struggle with the instinctive desire will come, the ideal will be worsted in the battle and will become still weaker.

Can we develop and strengthen the love of the ideal at all? How can we develop it, if we can? What is the source of those further additions to the ideal's love which are made to it when love is growing?

These questions may be answered as follows :—

There is, as we shall study in one of the chapters that follow, an immense store of love in our subconscious mind which lies in reserve for our ideal. If it were possible for the ideal to acquire and monopolize the whole of this love

(and the ideal must try to monopolize it as it is really meant for it) the force of the instinctive desires must sink into insignificance as compared with its own force and all the instinctive desires must become its most willing servants. This store of love in the form of a surging tumultuous sea of energy is consciousness itself. It is the human self. Only a small part of this luminous essence, the consciousness, is shining above the un-conscious level ordinarily. This part is always looking around for beauty like the periscope of an immersed submarine searching for its target. As soon as a suitable object of beauty is discovered by it, it forms an initial attachment to it which goes on developing gradually if the object is really beautiful and worthy of love till the whole of the sub-merged consciousness, rising above the surface bit by bit, becomes attached to it. All our activities, and all our restlessness in life are due to the force of love in the sub-conscious mind which remains unused by the ideal. It is unattached and therefore yearns for beauty and struggles to reach it, pressing us, goading us towards it, and making us restless always. It is this force which is the urge of self. Peace of mind or happiness is the good-fortune of those persons alone who have managed to connect the whole of this love with the beauty of their ideal.

This connection develops gradually and can be achieved by two methods—firstly, the contemplation of the ideal's beauty and secondly, action for the ideal. In the case of the Right Ideal these two methods are expressed by two words which are, unfortunately, very much misunderstood in the modern age, I mean prayers and morality. Prayer or worship means simply the contemplation of the beauty of consciousness (the source of all beauty) which naturally involves an attitude of submission on account of the attraction for Beauty that results from it. Morality means to act in the service of the Right Ideal. The love of no ideal whether it is right or wrong can develop without contemplation of one form or another and action to suit it. Since every human being must love an ideal

there is no escape from either worship or moral action for any human being. But a man may choose the worship or moral action consistent with one ideal and reject that consistent with another. All advocates of wrong ideals suggest some forms of worship and lay down some laws of ethics suitable to their ideals. The preserved dead body of Lenin and the pictures, and statues of the leaders of Communism scattered throughout Russia are simply aids to the contemplation of the beauty of the communist's ideal intended to keep alive and develop the love of their followers. Books, periodicals, lectures, public functions and demonstrations, in fact all forms of education in the larger sense of the word, become aids to contemplation. Contemplation stimulates consciousness to search for beauty. At the same time it is itself the search for beauty being an activity of consciousness.

All feeling of beauty developed by contemplation, that is, all the love acquired in this way, is finally *tested by action*. We love an ideal and feel its beauty only to the extent to which we act for it. If we do not contemplate we cannot act, if we do not act we have lost the benefits of contemplation. Contemplation and action must go hand in hand in order to develop the ideal's love, in order to attach the whole of the love of self to beauty. Action for the ideal means struggle with the compulsion of instincts which is very hard in the beginning but which becomes easier and easier as love develops. The more we struggle against the instincts the greater is the development of our love. We must therefore jump at whatever opportunities of struggling with our instinctive desires we can find because every advantage that the ideal secures in this struggle will make it stronger for the next battle, and will make the instinctive desire weaker as a rival to it, and that is the only way in which we can hope to make the ideal strong. If we cannot find such opportunities in the ordinary course of things we must create them. This explains why some religions suggest fasting or celibacy or impose

other hardships of the body as a measure of discipline. Their object is not so much to curb the instinctive desires as to develop the ideal's love by giving it the opportunities of effort and struggle against them. It is not the number and duration of such practices, primarily, that is important but their result which should be the growth of love.

When the ideal loses a battle against an instinctive desire the urge of self is forced to express itself in the latter. But in such a case the action by means of which we satisfy the instinctive desire does not give us either a complete or a permanent satisfaction. The reason is that although for the time being—and this is the cause of the ideal's defeat—the whole of beauty is imagined to reside in the object of the instinctive desire yet we do feel unconsciously that there was something, some element or quality of beauty in the ideal, which does not exist in this object and which if pursued would have made the self completely happy. We suppress the desire for that something in the course of the act but when the act is over we become conscious of having lost it and consequently feel miserable. Extreme cases of this pulling of the self by two desires, known technically as a conflict or a dissociation of the mind, results in nervous diseases which the psycho-analyst claims to cure. Enough has been said so far to show that the cause of all such diseases is our inability to increase and develop the love of our ideal. That the ultimate cause of all such ailments is not the urge of sex as Freud has imagined, will be shown in the chapter on psycho-analysis.

By far the most important condition of the development of the ideal's love to an extent which makes it far stronger than any of the instinctive desires, or to an extent to which it is possible for it to develop is, that the ideal itself should be a perfection of Beauty; it should conform completely to our inner criterion of beauty, in brief it should be the Right Ideal. The love of a wrong ideal too developes by means of contemplation and action but there is a limit to its development beyond which these two in-

struments of development instead of adding to the ideal's love help to reveal the elements of ugliness that it contains. Thus they are valuable even in the case of a wrong love but only upto a certain extent.

There is no doubt that when we love an ideal whether it is right or wrong we attribute to it all the qualities of Consciousness, all the qualities that we desire, but we cannot be deceived for long. If there is any part of our inner criterion which the ideal is unable to satisfy and we become conscious of it, the self refuses to attach itself to it. As long as we love a wrong ideal some dissatisfaction with it lurks in our mind in a suppressed condition and it must come to the surface sooner or later. This dissatisfaction moreover, though concealed in the unconscious, interferes with the continued growth of the ideal's love, so that the whole of the store of the self's love can never be attached to a wrong ideal; some portion of it must always remain unused causing us an unconscious discontent which must rise to the surface of consciousness ultimately. Our suppressed doubts about the perfection of a wrong ideal are based on our inner criterion of beauty and on account of the unfailing operation of this criterion we must become conscious of the elements of ugliness that it happens to contain, sooner or later and must give it up. When people love wrong ideals they do so in proportion to their capacity to be deceived and their capacity to be deceived is in proportion to their desire for beauty.

It is the best man who best loves his ideal whether the ideal is right or wrong. But a wrong love cannot achieve the intensity of the right love. Doubt is the enemy of love. If we doubt the perfection of an ideal even unconsciously (and we do so when the ideal is wrong and incapable of satisfying our inner criterion of beauty) we cannot love it as fully and as constantly as we need to love an ideal because unconscious, suppressed doubts which hamper the growth of love become ultimately conscious and known in the course of contemplation and action. The Right

Ideal is the only ideal that contains intrinsic beauty, that is capable of attaching the whole of the self's love to itself and that can be loved constantly. Conversely, when the Right Ideal is unable to attach the whole of the self's love to itself we can be sure that we have lost the appreciation or realization of an aspect of its Beauty, have allowed it to get mixed up in our mind with some elements of wrong or ugliness and thus to deteriorate into a wrong ideal. As soon as we are able to get a full vision of its beauty again our love for it must increase again and must go on increasing till it has reached its maximum limit. Absence of the full vision of the ideal's beauty is at the bottom of it, whenever we are unable to act for the Right Ideal in opposition to our instinctive desires in spite of our avowed desire to serve it. A mere desire for service is not enough. We must have a strong love for the ideal in order to be able to serve it, a love which makes service, action and sacrifice, irresistible and this is certainly possible if all the love in store with the self and meant for the ideal is utilized by the ideal. There is no other remedy for a weak love except contemplation and action, that is worship and ethical discipline going hand in hand. We must pray and endeavour to act rightly in order to be able to act rightly.

Reason is our guide for action only in an indirect way because it can do no more than serve a higher guide which is intuition or feeling. We are directly guided in our actions only by feeling. When we think we are being guided by reason, we are really conscious of the help our intuition is taking from reason. When intuition or faith stimulated by reason more or less, has made us familiar with the Right Ideal as an ideal that responds to our inner desire for Beauty, to some extent, we can add to our knowledge of Beauty further by means of regular prayers. Then, all the knowledge of Beauty, all the love that we require, can come to us directly by means of worship supported by action. Worship is the expression of the existing feeling of Beauty leading to a still greater realiza-

tion of Beauty. Reason will no doubt still serve the ideal as an aid to the contemplation of its beauty or as a guide to our moral judgments when the quality of its service, as mentioned already, will depend upon the strength of our love for the ideal or the standard of our self-consciousness. But reason in the service of the Right Ideal is not an adequate aid to contemplation. The most adequate form of contemplation is praying. It is by worship, that is by direct contemplation and by action and not by reason that we can increase our love quickly and to the maximum limit. Even when reason is helping us to know Beauty it is not serving us directly, but it is only helping our intuition, faith, or feeling. What is fundamental and indispensable for the evolution of consciousness is contemplating, feeling and loving. Reason, *all by itself*, can give us no knowledge of Beauty and hence *no knowledge whatsoever.* Even scientific and mathematical knowledge is the result of feeling aided by reason.

It is very unfortunate that most of us want to know by reason what only feeling or love can make known to us. We need the knowledge of self, we need, that is, to feel and love. We should pray and thus feel and love directly instead of depending upon the extremely inadequate help of reason to make us feel and love. It is impossible to demonstrate logically the beauty of a picture to a man who does not contemplate it and is therefore unable to appreciate it. We cannot argue with the man to convince him that the picture is beautiful? we can only tell him to see the picture and appreciate it. So we can know consciousness by contemplating its Beauty *i.e.*, by praying. Some people when asked to pray in order to be able to know Consciousness demand a completely rational and logical knowledge of Consciousness, before praying. But no rational or logical knowledge of Beauty is possible. As we cannot see the Sun with a candle so we cannot understand Beauty with the help of logic or reason. We can only feel it or love it and the capacity to feel and love can be enlarged

by worship and action and not by arguing or reasoning.

We argue, criticize and question only as long as we are unable to feel the beauty of Consciousness to the fullest extent. When we have acquired all the knowledge of Beauty that we want, we enjoy a peace of mind and a satisfaction which makes all questions and criticisms impossible. Doubting and questioning means seeking and seeking is due to the unsatisfied craving of love for Beauty residing in the unconscious mind. A man who has satisfied that love completely, a man who has obtained all that his nature demands can seek nothing. He is convinced, calm and contended. A conviction of having known something which includes all knowledge fills his mind. That is why all the prophets and saints, the greatest teachers of humanity, have made direct appeals to believe, obey and act instead of giving logical, philosophical and scientific discourses in proof of the truths taught by them. That is why we should refrain from making too logical an approach to the language of books revealed to these prophets if we want to understand their meaning rightly, the sort of approach, for example, we are accustomed to make to the language of books written by our intellectual geniuses. Their words unlike the words of scholars express an emotion or a feeling as a whole and do not enunciate logically defended propositions arranged and demonstrated in a logical order. The reason is that they have grasped the whole truth which only feeling or love could reach and to prove it rationally would be to detract from its value, to change it into a falsehood. Absence of a logically well-defended philosophy and strictly logical arrangement of ideas is one of the signs by which we can recognize a really revealed book. The highest knowledge, the knowledge of Reality, that is, does not admit of a total intellectual or mathematical proof. This is in fact true of all knowledge. The present book as a rational expression of my feeling can never do justice to the whole of my feeling and to the extent to which it depends upon mere rationality it is

imperfect, because although its arguments may be highly convincing it must leave much, that is unproved and unexplained from the point of view of Mathematical precision. This must apply to every philosophical interpretation of the Universe that has been attempted so far, or may be attempted in future.

The source of morality is our attraction for Beauty. The greater our love for Beauty or for the Right Ideal, the nearer are our actions to the attributes of Beauty and the higher is the standard of our morality. All the attributes of Consciousness have an attraction for us and by acting morally *i.e.*, in the service of the Right Ideal, we express those attributes and make them our own; we approach nearer to the Creator as well as to ourselves.

Love is the central or the principal attribute of consciousness. All its other attributes become manifest in loving and because of loving. This is true of the Divine Self as well as of the human self. Consciousness, wherever it is, loves an ideal. The ideal of the human self is the Divine Self and the ideal of the Divine Self is the perfect man, that is to say, a perfect society which has yet to make its appearance as a result of the gradual creation and evolution of the Universe. Both the human self and the Divine Self are loving and seeking each other. Consciousness created the Universe out of love for its ideal, and all its attributes are expressed in and because of its creative activity stimulated by love. The Divine Self is Love because It loves an ideal which is the human self. It is Beauty because the human self loves It. It is Creativeness because It acts for and realizes an ideal. It is Truth because It is the only reality that we are seeking. That Goodness is also a quality of consciousness like Love, Beauty, Power, Truth and Creativeness, follows similarly from the fact that Consciousness has an ideal which necessitates an ethical law. The ideal requires action and action has to follow a certain law in order to achieve its purpose. The moral actions of the Creator, which means all actions in His case,

are rooted in His love for the ideal. The creative activity of Consciousness is manifested in the form of attraction and repulsion. It is attracted to those actions which are capable of realizing the beauty of Its ideal and is repelled from the reverse. Thus in creating the Universe from moment to moment Consciousness is expressing all Its attributes.

In the case of the human self too all the attributes of consciousness are expressed in loving and because of loving. Our moral actions like the moral actions of the Creator are rooted in the love of the ideal. In order to achieve our ideal we feel attracted towards certain acts and feel repelled from certain others. When we love the Right Ideal we act for it and thereby indulge in a moral and creative activity in which we express all the qualities of consciousness. Some of these qualities are more visible in some actions than in others. You can express no quality of consciousness without expressing all its other qualities more or less because all qualities of consciousness are inclusive of one another. Both in the case of the Divine Self and the human self to have an ideal is to love, and to love is to act and to act is to create, to display beauty, to feel attraction, to feel repulsion, to assert power, to be good or moral, to know Truth and to be known as truth, in short to express all the qualities of consciousness.

The Ethical Law of the Divine Self is the same as the Ethical Law of the human self because the object of both is the same, that is, the creation and evolution of the Universe which means the creation, and evolution of self. The evolution of the Universe in the form of a flow of feeling or a current of consciousness evolving itself and going back to its source through the working of the double principle of attraction and repulsion may be compared to an artist's production of a picture.

What happens when a real artist paints a picture, say, when a Leonardo paints a Madonna?

The artist has never in his mind an exact copy of what he desires to create. If he were to have it, he would not be

an artist but only a copyist. He would not be a creator but only an imitator. Creation is free activity following only a desire for beauty. The artist has what we call an inspiration. There is a sort of a tide of feeling in his mind, the experience of a love of something unknown which is within his mind, and which he wants to express. He feels the love of a beauty which he has yet to create. He has a feeling of separation from that beauty as if it is something different from him but really it is not different from him but a part of him. The sense of separation however stimulates his desire to reach it.

The beauty that the artist feels is his ideal, the realization of which follows a process of evolution. The tide in his mind results in an out-flow of a current of feeling or thought as water wells out of a fountain on account of its own inner pressure. The feeling realizes itself gradually in the growing picture. The picture evolves bit by bit coming nearer and nearer to the impression of the artist. The picture becomes perfect when the feeling is expressed and realized completely. It becomes perfect in proportion as it approaches the original feeling. The stages through which the picture evolves are stages in the creative activity of the artist. As the lines and shades begin to spread themselves on the paper or canvas, the desire of the artist pushes them forward to an ever greater and greater complication and organization so as to bring them nearer and nearer to its own realization. The desire evolves the picture to its end of perfection. In fact it is the desire itself that takes the form of the lines and curves of the picture. The lines and curves have no meaning apart from the desire. They are created and evolved, changed and modified by the desire to suit itself. They represent the artist's desire. The feeling of the artist has certain potentialities which unroll themselves in the picture, in its lines and curves.

In his effort to express himself the artist goes on choosing certain lines and curves and rejecting certain others. He judges some of them to be suitable to his purpose and

others as unsuitable to it. We may say that he follows a certain moral code in the preparation of his picture. His choice follows the principle of attraction and repulsion causing him to prefer some lines and curves and to reject others throughout till the picture is complete. The cause of his choice and his judgment is his feeling of beauty, his desire which is expressing itself in his creative activity. Choice is indispensable to, nay it is what constitutes, his creative activity. Creation is an act of simultaneous preference and rejection. It is a process of loving and hating at the same time. *All creation, whether it is divine or human, takes the form of a search for some beloved.*

As the picture approaches the impression, the feeling or the desire of the artist, it comes to have and to reflect, more and more of the artist in it. Although the picture is separate and different from the artist, it is in a way the artist himself because we can see the artist in the picture.

The artist's ideal is the perfection of the picture or, what is the same thing, his ideal is the perfect realization of his own feeling of beauty in the picture. This ideal causes the movement or the activity of his self. The ideal realized in the form of the picture is outside the self and yet it is not outside it but within it. The picture comes from within but as it approximates more and more to the internal impression, it returns more and more to its source. The nearer it is to its source in its qualities the more highly evolved and the more perfect it is. The self of the artist has a feeling of incompleteness without his ideal and this feeling drives him towards it. The ideal is a part of his self; that is why the self is attracted towards it. Attraction means the search for completeness. When the self is realizing its ideal it may appear to us to be moving towards something outside it, but really it is moving towards itself, towards something which is within it. The activity of the self is like an arrow which although shot from the bow is yet ever approaching the bow.

The artist's attraction for his ideal of beauty, which is

the picture, starts a creative activity which brings him nearer and nearer to it. But attraction cannot be imagined apart from repulsion. His activity involves at each step a choice or a judgment resulting in the preference of those lines and curves that are favourable to his purpose and the rejection of those that are unfavourable to it. Attraction and repulsion both guide his creative activity. It is not only he who is attracted towards certain lines and curves and repelled from certain others but in a way, the lines and curves too have an attraction or an affinity for certain other lines and curves which fit in with them and a repulsion from others which do not suit them. Thus, in a way, the picture too participates in the activity of the artist. It collaborates with him in order to reach its own perfection. Its collaboration is however derived from the activity of the artist. The picture is in a sense alive and borrows its life from the artist. It represents his living desire. The real existence of the picture is in the artist's self and not on the paper. The picture on the paper is a reflection or a projection of the living reality which is in the mind of the artist. The picture is alive because it is a part of the artists' self which is life. It is, moreover, alive in proportion as it is true to its source in the self, in that part of the self which is evolving the picture. The picture is feeling, it is consciousness, life.

Not only do all the qualities of the artist's self that is Love, Beauty, Power, Creativeness, Truth and Goodness (Morality) find an expression and an exercise in his creation of the picture but the picture too is endowed more and more with the qualities of consciousness as it approaches its source. The emotion in the artist's mind is expressed in the picture. The picture, if it is perfect, represents the living desire of the artist. It is as alive and conscious as the artist himself. As the picture approaches perfection, the impression of the artist becomes clearer and clearer to him so that he has to make less and less effort to complete it. This means that the picture itself gains in affinity for its own

perfection. It acquires a greater and greater attraction for suitable lines and curves and thereby, in a way, takes the burden of the artist more and more upon itself; it is able to collaborate with the artist more and more. We may say that as the picture nears perfection it gains not only in life but also in freedom to move towards its own perfection. Our freedom as well as our life are in proportion to our love for perfection. Freedom and life are really two different names for one and the same thing. We live in the exact degree in which we are free and vice versa. We must remember in this connection again that the real picture and the real lines and curves are in the self of the artist and are therefore alive and active.

Although the artist may not depict on the paper actually all the lines and curves that are unfavourable to his purpose yet they exist in his mind and cause that judgment and that choice which constitutes his creative activity itself. Where ever there is attraction, repulsion also must be there. Attraction leads to movement and movement implies two directions, one towards the destination and the other away from it and opposite to it. Unless an object has left some distance behind itself, it has not moved forward. Without repulsion there would be no attraction and without attraction and repulsion both operating simultaneously there would be no choice, no movement, no creation. The artist cannot desire, choose or create without attracting and repelling so that attraction and repulsion exhibit themselves as qualities of his feeling. The choice of the artist from moment to moment is a proof that the material that he prefers and the material that he rejects at every step must both be existant in his mind. What the artist rejects is present latently in his consciousness and comes relatively to the forefront at the time of choice. It rises from a depth to a comparatively higher level. At the end of every choice, that is, every act of creation, he has to make a fresh choice which means that new matter comes into existence or rather rises to the

surface of his mind out of which he has to sift that which is favourable to his purpose from that which is unfavourable to it. To create is therefore to bring both the desirable and the undesirable to the forefront and to sift the desirable from the undesirable. The nearer a possibility is to the desirable the nearer it is to the focus of attention. In creation attention follows the desirable and the beautiful.

In the case of the divine artist, however, all the possibilities of creation out of which a sifting has to be made take a material form and all the lines and curves, the discarded as well as the favoured ones, become visible because for the Divine Self to think is to bring into existence. All life that proves favourable to the scheme of evolution is retained, preserved and evolved and all life that is unfavourable to it, is allowed to perish sooner or later as irrelevant to the picture. The perfect man, the real picture in the Divine Mind which the Divine Self intends to create alone is immortal.

To continue the analogy of the human artist, his inspiration creates, so to say, two opposite charges of feeling, one on his ideal of beauty, his picture of the future, and the other on his own self, so that both attract each other. The picture seeks its source in the artist's self, that is the impression in his mind, in order to come into its own and the artist's self seeks its ideal of beauty in the form of the picture without which it feels incomplete and towards which it is therefore attracted. The picture and the artist both feel incomplete without each other and therefore seek each other. There is however no fundamental incompleteness on either side. The picture still enfolded is already complete in the artist's mind and the artist's ideal is already a part of his self although the self regards it as different from itself for the time being, which explains its attraction and approach towards it. Because it is in the self as well as outside it, two opposite charges of feeling come to exist side by side in the creating self of the artist by virtue of his inspiration or vision of beauty, almost in the same way in which they may

exist in a metallic ball in which electricity has been induced by say a positively charged glass rod held close to it. The rod induces an opposite charge, in this case a negative one, on the part of the ball nearer to it on account of its attraction for the charge on the rod and a similar charge on the part away from it, on account of its repulsion from the rod. Thus the positive charge is in the ball as well as outside it as the ideal is in the self as well as outside it. The rod attracts the ball as the ideal attracts the self.

Each one of us, too, is an artist like the Divine Self making the picture of his own life. We are creators and we are creating ourselves out of ourselves as the artist who paints a picture creates himself out of himself. We have a desire for beauty and that desire we are trying to realize and satisfy always. We are always choosing *i.e.* preferring some actions to others on account of our desire for beauty and the need to satisfy it. There are certain things which, we imagine, complete the picture and there are others that appear to us to mar it; we are always loving and choosing the former and hating and rejecting the latter. This constitutes the art of living. We are good artists of the picture of our life only if we choose rightly but we cannot choose rightly unless we have an intense passion for the Right Ideal. If we develop this passion we shall love and act what the Creator loves and acts and we shall choose what the Creator chooses. In the analogy of picture and the artist, the picture, we said, gains in life as well as freedom to make itself. But supposing whatever life and freedom it achieves at any stage of its evolution is such that on account of it, it can really add to itself some lines and curves in order to complete itself. Of course it will improve itself in this way with the help of the life-force of the artist that it has come to make its own. Then it will evolve and reach perfection only if it uses the freedom and the life that it has acquired, to carry out the desire of the artist and follow the impression in his mind. If it does not follow the same ethical code and does not choose the same lines and curves which

the artist would choose himself, it will spoil itself and will fail to share the beauty which is in the mind of the artist *i.e.*, the beauty of his impression. The ethical code for the picture and the artist is the same. Both desire the same result—the perfection of the picture. If the picture wants to achieve perfect beauty it must attract those very lines and curves to which the artist would be attracted himself. The picture, the real picture, we must recall, is helping its own evolution. The real picture is in the mind of the artist. It is alive and is sharing the creative activity of the artist. It is actually creating itself out of itself by efforts which are its own from one point of view and those of the artist from another point of view.

Such is the case with the human self too. The Divine Self and the human self follow the same Ethical Law, because they desire the same result—the perfection of man. Any freedom, life or power that the human self has achieved should be utilized to achieve more freedom or, which is the same thing, more life, more beauty and more perfection. Conscious obedience to the Right Ethical Law is necessary if we want to march forward on the high-road of progress. Just as the creation or the evolution of the picture is the self-realization of the artist as well as of the picture, so the creation or the evolution of the Universe is the self-realization of the Divine Consciousness as well as of the human consciousness.

The inspiration of the Divine Artist like that of the human artist resulted in an ideal of beauty, the love or the attraction for which started the activity which brought the Universe into existence. The evolving man is a meaning in the mind of the Creator as the growing picture is a meaning in the mind of the artist. The whole picture in the Creator's mind has not yet evolved. The evolving picture of the Universe or the personality of the human social individual of the earth, the creation and evolution of which began as a diffusion of cosmic rays in a distant past, is yet imperfect, as a part of it yet exists in the mind of the Creator

and has to be realized in actual creation. We are to collaborate with the World-Self in this creation. We may say that the Universe bears a charge of feeling opposite to that of the Creating Self so that it is attracted towards its source and wants to go back to it. It is therefore evolving gradually like the picture through the creative activity of the Divine Self following a desire for beauty, expressed in attraction and repulsion. In this way it is approaching closer and closer to its original in the Divine Consciousness. Attraction for what was favourable to the ideal implied a repulsion from what was unfavourable to it and therefore these two principles of attraction and repulsion expressed themselves as qualities of consciousness. They remained operative throughout in the evolution of the Universe in the past and must continue to operate in future. The whole Universe is an activity of the forces of attraction and repulsion. All attraction or repulsion in the Universe has its source in the attraction of World-Consciousness for Its ideal of beauty, the perfect man of the future.

This principle of attraction which of course includes repulsion constitutes the Divine Ethical Law, or the Law of the Right Ideal which is observed by the whole Universe, by matter, by the animal and by man alike. The attraction for the source of consciousness is present in everything in the Universe from the tiny election to the highest embodiments of creation, the saints and prophets. It is shared by all forms of matter, by all varieties of animals and by all human beings. At each stage of life's development it takes a form which corresponds to that stage. It carries forward the process of evolution through every stage changing its own form at every step in a manner suitable to the needs of evolution. The evolution of the Universe is only the evolution of the forms of this attraction. In the material stage it changed from the attraction of the opposite charges of electricity observed in protons and electrons to the attraction of gravity and all those forms of affinities which we call the physical laws. It

helped evolution in this stage by changing and preparing matter into a form suitable for the appearance of the animal life. In the animal stage it emerged in the form of instincts and continued to change till all the instincts were developed. In this stage it continued to evolve the animal into a form suitable for the appearance of man till man actually came into existence. In the human stage it takes the form of a free and direct attraction for Beauty or Consciousness and continues to change its character becoming more and more perfect with the growth of love or the development of self-consciousness. That the Moral Law is changing in character and evolving itself also in the human stage of evolution is clear from the fact that our standards of ethical behaviour differ at different stages of self-consciousness. They grade upwards from the lowest to highest levels of self-consciousness. The actual, practical ethical code of a highly self-conscious man is superior to that of a man in the earlier stages of his self-consciousness. The double principle of attraction and repulsion will help evolution in the human stage of life too by evolving the human being into a new kind of life in which his self-consciousness will achieve its highest development. If we observe the Moral Law consciously we shall reach our perfection, otherwise the principle of repulsion in the Universe will cast us away and the principle of attraction will favour, preserve and evolve that part of human life which follows this law.

The analysis of the creative activity of the human self-consciousness, given in the example of the artist and the picture above illustrates several points of the relationship between the Creator and the Universe (Man). To love an ideal and to act for its realization, expressing all the attributes of Love (*e.g.* Creativeness. Power, Goodness, Beauty, Truth etc.) in the process of its realization is a quality of self-consciousness whether it is human or divine. As the ideal of the artist is the perfect picture which he desires to create so the ideal of the Creator is the perfect Universe (Man) which he is creating and evolving every

moment. Self-Consciousness means consciousness which is conscious of itself, and it can be conscious of itself, of its qualities and capacities, only with reference to something other than itself and that something is conceived by it in the form of an ideal of beauty which it sets out to achieve. But since self-consciousness alone is beauty and nothing beautiful and worthy of love can possibly exist outside itself, it sees its own beauty in the mirror of its ideal, its ideal is its own image, it is the loving and the creating self-consciousness itself in miniature. Thus self-consciousness by its very nature divides itself into two parts the knower and the known the Lover and the Beloved, the Creator and the Creation, the Seeker and the Sought. These two parts of self-consciousness are separate and yet not separate from each other; they are distinguishable and yet belong to a single indivisible personality. They are moreover not separate compartments of the same mind but each of them is the whole mind. The stream of consciousness evolving the picture is *not the person of the artist* but only his *desire* or *will*; yet the will of the artist, through which he exercises all his qualities and attributes is the artist himself acting in the picture. Similarly, *the current of consciousness evolving the Universe is not the person of the Creator but only His desire or will*; yet the will of the Creator which operates all His qualities and attributes is He Himself, acting in the Universe. In spite of this, however, we can identify neither the artist with the picture nor the Creator with the Universe, since as the artist can create many pictures, so the Creator can create innumerable worlds. This resolves the problem of the transcedence and the immanence of the Creator in the Universe.

A self-consciousness is something which is capable of projecting itself beyond itself into a created and being-created otherness which is no other than itself and nothing beyond itself, without altering or diminishing itself or losing its oneness or uniqueness in the least. There is nothing in the material world which can be compared to self-consciousness in this quality. We may imagine a sun which

sheds it rays far and wide into space without losing any of its energy or brilliance but a sun of this kind is not possible.

The fact of evolution, namely, that the Universe is being created by an unbroken, gradual and progressive evolutionary process (even if Science had nothing to say in support of it) follows from the very nature of self-consciousness which has one ideal at a time and resorts to a constant creative activity (like a chain in which every link leads to another) for its realization. Every creative act of self-consciousness whether divine or human is, in its actual unfoldment, a single, indivisible whole which is internally consistent and in which every part supports and completes the rest. The creative act of the Divine Self-Consciousness, which is unfolding itself before us in the shape of this Universe, is also a single indivisible whole of the same kind. This is what creates a unity and a uniformity of design and purpose in the Universe and makes Science and Philosophy possible. All sciences and all departments of Philosophy belong to a single integrated whole of knowledge and therefore should be expected to explain each other.

The Creator creates freely whatever he loves to create consistently with his ultimate purpose. He does not follow any pre-conceived laws but only his own desire for beauty. It is we who read or discover laws and principles at all levels of creation—the physical, the biological and the psychological levels—and record them in our books of Science and Philosophy. The source of all these laws is nothing but the Creator's *desire* to create. That is why Science has not been able to explain the final cause of even a single law out of the innumerable laws that it has discovered. As a matter of fact *no law of nature has any cause except the will of the Creator itself.* As soon as the Creator wills an object it comes into existence and as soon as he wills it to change in a particular manner it changes accordingly and this gives rise to the laws of Science. Before water had come into existence no scientist (if a scientist had existed at that time) could have predicted

that oxygen and hydrogen will combine in a particular proportion to form water. The fact is that they form water for no other reason except this that the Creator has willed it to be so. The will of the Creator is the cause of every new step in the evolution of the Universe as the will of the artist is the cause of every new step in the evolution of the picture. The inability of the scientists to trace the achievements of evolution to previous causes has taken the shape of a new theory of evolution which is known as the theory of *emergent evolution*.

The Divine Self-Consciousness wills and acts with a perfect freedom for the realization of Its ideal and so does the human self-consciousness, which is an image of the Divine Self-Consciousness and shares with It all Its attributes including Its attribute of free-will. When we choose a line of action, we no doubt take into consideration all the limitations of our circumstances and surroundings, but the fact that we, after considering everything, reject all courses of action except one, of our own free choice, is a proof that *our wills are free*. There can be no greater evidence than that of our own experience, leading to a firm conviction, to prove that we choose our decisions and actions whether right or wrong with a perfect freedom. But this freedom, although absolutely perfect and real, is not our own, it is borrowed from the Creator, it is the freedom of the Creator emerging in the shape of our own freedom. Hence from one point of view it is our own freedom and from another point of view it is the freedom of the Creator.

Our free activity is also the free activity of the Creator. Both as the free activity of the Creator and our own free activity it is either relevant to the purpose of the Creator as the artist of the Universe, or irrelevant to it. If it is relevant, it means that we have used our freedom rightly and our actions belong to that lot which go to complete the picture of the Universe as it is in the mind of the Creator. Hence the free creative activity of the Divine Self favours them

and makes them the object of His love along with their human agents. This is our reward for having used our freedom rightly. If however, it is irrelevant to the purpose of the Creator it means that we have misused our freedom and made our actions to deviate from the path along which evolution is to proceed. In such a case our actions meet with an ultimate failure and bring us bitter disappointments and grievous calamities. The reason is that they belong to that lot which the free creative activity of the Divine Self has to reject and discard along with their human agents in order to bring the picture of the Universe to a perfection. This is how we pay for having made a wrong use of our freedom.

However, as the self-consciousness of an individual evolves and his knowledge of the ideal of the Creator, which is at the same time his own ideal, develops, the chance for him to act wrongly becomes less and less till ultimately it disappears entirely. Thus the only way to share successfully the purpose of the Creator in our own lives and to avoid our failures, disappointments and miseries is to rise continuously to higher and higher levels of self-consciousness by (*a*) acting morally and (*b*) contemplating regularly the Beauty of the Creator.

Chapter VI

THE CURRENT THEORIES OF HUMAN NATURE—I

(McDougall)

Philosophers have entertained different theories so far about the mental sources of human activity. Socrates believed that reason is the sole determinant of the quality of human action. Virtue is the result of knowledge and vice is the result of ignorance. Plato built his theory of the state on this hypothesis and advocated the necessity of a philosopher king who alone was fit to rule. But much to his disappointment mere reason could not turn the learned prince of Syracuse into a practical philosopher. Aristotle was equally enamoured of reason but unable to understand the real source of man's higher purposes ended by justifying the slavery of some men in order that some others may be able to exercise their reason—a most unreasonable point of view indeed, which we find revived in modern times only in Hitler's idea of the superiority and exceptional rights of the German race.

The view that reason is the controlling faculty of human action dominated philosophy for two thousand years till Bentham declared that the activities of man were determined not by reason or by knowledge and ignorance but by the desire to get pleasure and avoid pain. His theory although highly plausible, could not form an adequate explanation of human nature. It was pointed out against him that man did not desire things because they were pleasant but they were pleasant because he desired them. Karl Marx, in the nineteenth century, built up a

highly ingenius philosophy on the fundamental hypothesis that the instinct of feeding was the sole urge of human life—a philosophy which has captivated millions of people in the present age. But his theory too is unable to account for many facts of human nature, for example, the love of art or knowledge or morality for its own sake. Sigmund Freud maintained that the sexual instinct is at the bottom of all the activities of man. Adler, a pupil of Freud came to differ from his master because of the exaggerated importance he attached to the sex instinct and evolved the theory that the instinct of self-display or self-assertion is the life dynamic. Jung advocated the view, which may be regarded as a compromise between Freud and Adler, that the urge of life is of a general nature manifesting itself sometimes on the side of feeling and sometimes on the side of conation. McDougall one of the most well-known of all modern psychologists holds that all human activity is due to the instincts which man inherits from his animal ancestors. Although there is no general agreement among philosophers about the psychology of human action, yet it appears that learned opinion inclines most of all to the theories of McDougall, Freud, Adler and Marx, all of whom maintain that man is a creature of impulses which have their source in the instincts. Since our own view, that there exists in the nature of man an important and powerful urge which cannot be traced to any of the instincts and which is ultimately the sole determinant of human action, runs counter to these theories, it becomes necessary to examine its justification relatively to them. In the present chapter we shall discuss it with particular reference to the theory of McDougall.

It is needless to say that if there is sn the nature of man an urge apart from the urge of instincts it is highly important for us to know this fact, because it is then only that we can study these two sources of human action separately and understand them correctly in relation to each other. If there could be a general agreement among the psycholo-

gists that there are two separate categories of the requirements of human nature, one resulting from our animal instincts and the other having its source in a special urge of the human being which rules the instincts, it will form the basis of a highly valuable constructive work for the future by means of which it will be possible to reduce to order many problems of our social sciences which have baffled the understanding of scholars so far and which, if solved, would make us far more contented and happier than we are at present.

"The instincts," says professor McDougall "are the prime movers of all human activity; by the conative or the impulsive force of some instinct every train of thought however cold and passionless it may seem is borne along towards its end......All the complex intellectual apparatus of the most highly developed mind is but the instrument by which these impulses seek their satisfaction....Take away these instinctive dispositions with their powerful mechanisms and the organism would become incapable of activity of any kind; it would be inert and motionless like a powerful piece of clock-work whose mainspring has been removed."

But according to McDougall man inherits all his instincts from the animals. Therefore it is evident that their true character, unalloyed with other factors that human nature may have developed, must be the same as we find it to be in the animal world. If we understand the nature of the urge of instincts in the animal we can understand it also in man, and when we understand it in man we can be in a position to distinguish it from any other urge that may be the special possession of man and that he may have developed over and above the urge of instincts.

In the animal world the instincts serve a biological purpose. They preserve the life of the individual and the species; one can expect that they will perform the same function when they reach higher up in man, because biologically the needs of man are not different from the

needs of the animal. Mc Dougall concedes this point but he is of the opinion that because man has developed intelligence therefore in him the urge of instincts becomes modified under its influence, '*giving rise to the character and will of individuals and nations*'.

There is no doubt that man is able to modify his instinctive desires and to satisfy them in a much more complicated manner than an animal does. But reason all by itself is unable to modify an urge. The modification occurs whenever there is a necessity to give expression to the conflicting demands or desires of our nature at the same time. Although reason can guide a desire and point out the way in which it can satisfy itself most suitably and in perfect harmony with other desires of our nature, yet it is not a desire itself. It is only a discriminating faculty helpful to us in the satisfaction of our desires. Reason is rightly known as the handmaid of desire. It can not modify a desire or create an obligation by itself. An instinctive urge is modified only when its natural strength is increased or decreased above or below its natural level which is the same in man and in animal. We may say that we sometimes satisfy our instinctive appetite *much less* than we need biologically, by our own choice and intentionally, for the sake of an ideal because we are guided by reason. But how is it that sometimes we have a much greater attraction for our instinctive desires and indulge in them to a *much greater* extent than our psycho-physical dispositions or our biological necessities would require? It cannot be due to reason because it is unreasonable on the surface of it. It cannot be due to any of the instincts because an animal never does it, although the satisfaction of an instinctive impulse is accompanied by the same pleasure in man as in the animal. Evidently, there is another urge at work which checks the desire of the instinct in the former case and reinforces it in the latter.

Even when we are modifying our instinctive desires with the help of reason, there must be some other urge or desire

which reason is guiding and which is ultimately responsible for this modification. The modification occurs because the demands of this urge have to be accommodated. The other urge may be clearly an instinct some times *e.g.* when a hungry child foregoes the idea of opening the door of a cupboard till the arrival of his mother for *fear* of punishment. But sometimes the interfering urge appears to be entirely different in character from the urge of any of the instincts enumerated by McDougall. This urge which has the tendency to become more powerful than any of our instinctive desires and to dominate them all is known as volition or will. McDougall explains volition as again due to instincts. We believe, however, that no adequate explanation of will is possible, unless we take it as due to an urge separate from the urge of instincts, an urge which may be called the urge of man himself and not of his animal nature, and that the phenomenon of volition affords the clearest evidence of the existence of such an urge.

Will is an effort for moral action the desire for which is weak as compared with the temptation which is definitely an instinctive desire. Professor James writes, 'And if a brief definition of ideal or moral action were required none could be given which would better fit the appearances than this. 'It is action in the line of the greatest resistance'.

"The facts may be most briefly symbolised thus, P standing for the propensity, I for the ideal impulse, and E for the effort.'

$I \text{ per se } < P$

$I + E > P$" (*)

What is the origin of this effort E which overcomes the resistance and brings about the moral action? Professor James says nothing in answer to this question. Writes McDougall :—

"Professor James like many others finds here an ultimate and irresolvable problem in face of which we can

* James: Principles of Psychology Vol. II, p. 549.

only say—the will exerts itself on the side of the weaker motive and enables it to triumph over its stronger antagonist—while leaving the word 'will' simply as the name for this possibility of an influx of energy of whose source, causes or antecedents we can say nothing....Presumably according to professor James this is where every attempt to trace the volitional process from its effects backwards comes against a dead wall of mystery because the inhibiting stroke (he talks of the inhibition of rival impulses due to instincts which is accomplished by volitional effort) issues from some region inaccessible to our intellects or simply happens without antecedents".

McDougall's own explanation is that the source of the additional motive power, which in the moral effort of will is thrown upon the side of the weaker, more ideal impulse is the instinct of self-display or self-assertion". "That this is true" says Dr. McDougall, "we may see clearly in such a simple case of volition as that of a boy overcoming by effort of the will, owing to the presence of spectators, an impulse of fear that restrains him from some desired object. He makes his effort and overcomes his fear impulse because we say, he knows his companions are looking at him; the impulse of self-display is evoked on the side of the weaker motive. And the same is true of those more refined efforts of the will in which the operation of this impulse is so deeply obscured that it has not hitherto been recognized".

And McDougall assures us that there is no awkwardness about this explanation although "it may seem paradoxical and repugnant to our sense of the nobility of moral conduct that it (moral conduct) should be exhibited as dependent on an impulse that we share with the animals and which in them plays a part that is of a secondary importance and utterly a-moral....The humble nature of the remote origins of anything we justly admire or revere in no wise detracts from its intrinsic worth or dignity and the ascertainment of those origins need not and should not

diminish by one jot our admiration or reverence."

A really admirable thing may no doubt easily have a very humble origin, but McDougall's explanation of the source of will is not only repugnant to our sense of the nobility of moral conduct however unreasonable this repugnance may be according to him, but is also unjustified and unconvincing from a purely rational point of view.

If will is due to the instinct of self-assertion the question arises: Why does the instinct become active in favour of the weaker desire rather than the stronger one? Both the desires, the weaker as well as the stronger one, have their source in the instincts. Why should the weaker desire be an object of special favour with the instinct of self-assertion? The instinct could satisfy itself equally, nay, perhaps more easily and more adequately in the case of the stronger desire, for example, when you fight an enemy rather than forgive him or when you give him a slap for a slap rather than turn your other cheek towards him; then why does it support the weaker desire alone? Moreover, it is in connection with such coarser and stronger desires of the animal nature that this instinct was most active all along in its history. Why should it forget its old habit and lose its original function entirely and begin to side with the weaker desire for moral action as soon as it reaches man?

The only distinction of man over the animal which McDougall concedes is his capacity for reason. Then should we think that the instinct's preference for the weaker desire in the case of man, is due to the influence of reason? But there are innumerable cases in which the effort of will cannot be justified on the score of reason. People otherwise sane show readiness to suffer all sorts of privations and even death for the sake of avowed principles. Many a martyr in the history of our race was confronted with one of the two alternatives: dignity, power and riches on the one hand and death and disgrace on the other, but he decided in favour of the latter course and preferred self-annihilation to self-assertion. Reason cannot justify

it, nor can one understand by any stretch of imagination how the preference of poverty to power in such cases is due to the instinct of self-assertion.

McDougall himself says that a person's desire for even that form of self-assertion by means of which he seeks the approval of others and consequently puts forth volitional effort is inexplicable on grounds of rationality. He writes :—

"The strength of the regard men pay to public opinion, the strength of their desire to secure the approval and avoid the disapproval of their fellow men goes beyond all rational grounds; it cannot be wholly explained as due to regard for their own actual welfare or material prosperity or anticipation of the pain or the pleasure that would be felt on hearing men's blame or praise. For, as we know, some men otherwise rational and sane enough are prepared to sacrifice ease and enjoyments of every kind—in fact all the good things of life—if only they may achieve posthumous fame; that is to say their conduct is dominated by the desire that men shall admire or praise them long after they themselves shall have become incapable of being affected pleasurably or painfully by any expression of the opinions of others. The great strength in so many men of this regard for the opinions of others and the almost universal distribution of it in some degree may, then, fairly be said to present the most important and difficult of the psychological problems that underlie the theory of morals".

Thus for one thing it is not clear why the instinct of self-assertion should become active on behalf of the weaker desire in order to reinforce it, rather than on behalf of the stronger motive, when reason too is not responsible for this discrimination.

Secondly Dr. McDougall appears to be arguing in a circle. Why in the particular case mentioned by him does the boy's moral effort satisfy his instinct of self-assertion when others are looking on? His answer will be, because

society generally approves of such an effort and the boy's companions are sure to admire it. But why does society approve of it?

According to McDougall the society's approval is due to the fact that it has absorbed the higher moral tradition on account of the influence of rare personalities, the prophets and saints, who exert this influence in virtue of the admiration they evoke in us. But what is the cause of the admirable moral efforts of these saints and prophets who according to McDougall are the founders of the moral tradition? Certainly the cause of these efforts cannot be again the approval and admiration of the society (which is itself the result of the tradition founded by the saints and prophets) stimulating the saints and prophets' instinct of self-display. This will be arguing in a circle. And moreover what is the cause of our own admiration of the moral efforts of the saints and prophets because unless we admire them no tradition can be founded?

McDougall seems to have, at this place, lost sight of the fact that it will not be possible for us to admire the moral efforts of the prophets and to absorb from them the higher moral tradition, unless there existed in our own nature something which renders their moral efforts admirable in our eyes. In that something, whatever it is, we ought to look both for the cause of our own moral and volitional effort as well as of our admiration for the moral efforts of the saints and prophets as also for the cause of the moral efforts (resulting in the establishment of moral tradition) of the saints and prophets. If we say that that something is nothing other than the urge of self-consciousness for beauty peculiar to man and independent of the instincts, we are able to explain all the facts adequately. The urge of self-consciousness has no aim but its own satisfaction. Therefore it does not obey the common standards of rationality. Like every impulse it has its own rational standard. Reason is its servant and not its master. The weaker desire springs from this urge and is not weak

as a matter of fact but is only suppressed by instinctive desires. It comes into its own whenever on account of our intense love for the ideal we are able to turn our attention away from the instinctive desires and fix it on the ideal. It conquers the instinctive impulses by virtue of its own intrinsic strength. The 'inhibiting stroke' comes from the love of the ideal and its force is directly in proportion to this love. When the love of the ideal is very strong the instinctive desires are too weak to compete with the so-called 'weaker desire.' In such a case the proportion of strength of the two kinds of desires is reversed, the weaker becoming the stronger and the stronger becoming the weaker one and in such a case moral action involves no exertion or effort because no resistance exists. Such is the case with the heroes, martyrs, saints and prophets who act morally not as a result of effort and struggle like many of us but as a result of a desire which they would not like to resist. We see, therefore, that professor James' definition of moral action that it is 'action in the line of the greatest resistance' by no means holds good under all circumstances. *In very many cases moral action is action in the line of the least resistance.*

The boy whose example has been cited by McDougall was able to overcome the impulse of fear because his impulse for the ideal (which ideal was, of course, the approval of his friends) was able to gain in strength sufficiently to defeat the impulse of fear, at a time when his friends were looking on.

Thus our own explanation of will divides the desires of man into two parts; the desires of the human self and the desires of the animal nature of man *i.e.*, the instincts. The desire of the self is our own desire and we hold it to be more important than the desire of the instincts. When the self asserts its own desire over the instinctive desires we call it volition or will. That McDougall in spite of his effort to trace all the activities of man to the sole urge of instincts is compelled to assume this fact is clear

from the following passage :—

"The essential mark of volition—that which distinguishes it from simple desire or simple conflict of desires is that the personality as a whole or the central feature or nucleus of personality, the man himself or all that which is regarded by himself and others as the most essential part of himself is thrown upon the side of the weaker motive; whereas a mere desire may be felt to be something that in comparison with this most intimate nucleus of personality is foreign to the self, a force that we do not acknowledge as our own, which we or the intimate self may look upon with horror and detestation".

McDougall gives the various names of "personality as a whole", "the central feature or nucleus of personality", "the most intimate nucleus of personality", "the man himself", "the most essential part of man", the "intimate self" of man, to something which he is unable to define consistently with his theory of instincts but which is really no other than what we have denoted as the self or the self-consciousness in man. Although McDougall does not define what exactly this "most essential part of man" is, yet he realizes that it has a desire which, though weak in itself, is ultimately capable of dominating a stronger desire, directly due to one of the instincts,—a desire which it not only refuses to "acknowledge" as its "own" but also looks upon "with horror and detestation".

It is very surprising indeed that in spite of such a clear admission that the desires of the instincts are not only separate from the desire of something else in the nature of man which constitutes its vital factor, (he may call it the "intimate self of man" or "the most essential part of man" or give it any other name that he likes) but also opposed to it to the extent of inducing "horror and detestation", McDougall does not allow that instincts are not the only motive power of human action and that the vital portion of human nature is really independent of the instincts and forms a source of action apart from them.

McDougall believes that the desire of the intimate self *i.e.*, the weaker desire, is due to a sentiment possessed by it which he calls the sentiment of self-regard and a full grown sentiment according to him is nothing but a constellation or a group of all the instinctive emotions organising themselves gradually around an object. But, if this desire is really an outcome of a combination of all the instincts and is brought into existence by the combined emotional force of all of them as McDougall thinks, one cannot understand why it remains so weak in spite of it.

He writes :

"The organization of the sentiments in the developing mind is determined by the course of experience; that is to say the sentiment is a growth in the structure of the mind that is *not* natively given in the inherited constitution".

"Each sentiment has a life-history like every other vital organization. It is gradually built up, increasing in complexity and strength and may continue to grow indefinitely or may enter upon a period of decline and may decay slowly or rapidly partially or completely. When any of the emotions is strongly or repeatedly excited by a particular object there is formed the rudiment of a sentiment. . . . But it can seldom happen that a sentiment persists in this rudimentary condition for any long period of time. Any such sentiment is liable to die away for lack of stimulus or if further relations are maintained with its object, to develop into a more complex organization. Thus the simple sentiment of fear. . . . will tend to develop and will most readily become hate by the incorporation of other emotional dispositions. . . . they *all in virtue of their repeated excitement by this one object* become associated with the object more and more intimately until the mere idea of it may suffice to throw them all at once into a condition of such excitement, or to arouse all of them in turn or in conjunction to full activity. So the rudimentary sentiment whose emotional constituent is fear develops into a

full-blown hatred."*

Here we come across another fundamental point of our disagreement with McDougall in his theory of the will. The excitement of emotions is, as a matter of fact, *the result* and *not the cause* of sentiments. The sentiment exists already before an emotion is excited. Emotions are events in the career of a sentiment. When a man loves, for example, the ideal of Communism his love is able to arouse in him the emotions of pleasure, anger, fear, disgust, wonder, subjection, elation, gratitude, admiration, hope, relief, regret, disappointment etc. He admires the ideal, hopes that it will rule the world, fears that its enemies may wipe it out, wonders at its captivating philosophy, is displeased when a person condemns it, feels elated when it wins a victory, shows gratitude to a person who helps it, regrets when it suffers a set-back and so on. Evidently the fact is that each of these emotions is aroused in the man at its own particular occasion because he loves Communism. It is not a fact, as McDougall believes, that he loves Communism because the creed was able to excite each of these emotions in him continuously for some time, till each became a fixed attitude with respect to that ideal, so that his sentiment is nothing but a sum-total of these acquired attitudes. The excitement of his emotions at different occasions is the result and not the cause of his sentiment.

When we love, our sentiment is capable of exciting every emotion of which man is capable provided the situation corresponding to that emotion is created. The view of McDougall therefore necessitates the conclusion that a man cannot love an object till the object has had the chance of exciting each of his emotions without any exception sufficiently in duration and intensity to render it into a fixed attitude. It implies that as long as the excitation and the consequent fixation of the total number of emotions of which he is capable as a human being is not exhausted,

---

*Social Psychology—McDougall, pp. 140, 141, 142.

love cannot make its appearance, because if the sentiment of love is an organization of emotions, it is an organization of *all* of them without exception. This view is contrary to our experience. We love persons, objects or ideas because they are lovable, because we judge them as lovable and beautiful and not because they excite our emotions one after the other again and again till all of them become fixed and rooted and prone to be excited again. We feel that our love, for whatever object it may be, exists before any of our emotions gets the chance to be excited and that the emotion is excited *because* the love is already there.

A person changes his love from one object or idea to another sometimes so suddenly that no excitement of emotions is thinkable for example, when a Nazi may turn into a Communist overnight by studying a few lines in a book or by listening to a lecture. His conversion is due to his added knowledge of the case for Communism, of the arguments in its favour, resulting in a judgment of its greatness and a conviction of its truth. No excitement of emotions comes into the picture.

When the object of sentiment changes, the situations under which the emotions may be excited also change along with it immediately. The Nazi who turns a Communist finds that the occasions when he can feel gratitude, admiration, anger, disgust, disappointment etc. have altered simultaneously with his conversion. This would have been impossible unless it is a fact that the excitement of a person's emotions is determined by his love.

The emotions of a cultured man are aroused under situations which are vastly different from those which suffice to excite the emotions of a relatively uncivilized, uneducated person. When people come to be inspired by lofty ideals their emotional response towards events undergoes a marked change, for example, they forgive personal insults more readily than other men can do. Even when the change from one object of love to another is gradual (as when we take time to understand, appreciate or judge the

beauty of an object) it is never preceded by a repeated excitement of emotions.

Let us now consider this view with particular reference to the sentiment of hate. "The typical sentiments," says McDougall "are love and hate." If all sentiments are gradually developed organizations of emotions then hate as a sentiment must be also a similar organization and must have its own independent career of growth and decay like the sentiment of love. But it is easy to see that hate is not a separate sentiment, nor has it a separate career of growth and decay. It is subservient to our love, comes into existence with it, appears and disappears, increases and decreases in intensity along with it. There can be no love without hate. Hate is an aspect or facet of love. There is only one fundamental sentiment of which man is capable and that is love. We hate only those objects which interfere with and prove inconsistent with our love or our ideal. The strength of our hate is in proportion to our love. The more we love an object the more we hate the objects that oppose, violate or interfere with this love. Hate being the direct and immediate result of a love cannot be an organization of emotions developing gradually around an object. Its object is determined strictly, immediately, by the object of love and not be the accidental excitement of emotions. When our love changes its object our hate also changes its object at once. When we come to be thoroughly inspired by a new ideal suddenly, all our hates irrelevant to that ideal disappear at once and new hates relevant and subservient to that ideal appear immediately. How does it happen if the sentiment of hate is an organization of emotions and develops gradually by their repeated excitement? What is true of the sentiment of hate is true also of the sentiment of love. Just as the sentiment of hate is not a gradually developed organization of emotions so the sentiment of love too cannot be a gradually developed constellation of emotions.

McDougall counts a third sentiment, that of respect,

besides hate and love. But if respect is formal it is not a sentiment at all. It is a kind of discipline necessitated by some other object of love. If it is a genuine feeling it can be nothing but an aspect of love. We cannot really respect without loving, or love without respecting at least in the case of a perfect love and a perfect respect. When we love a person and do not respect him we love only a part of him and hate the other part and when we respect a person and do not love him we respect only a part of him and do not respect the other part. The highest love and the highest respect are ultimately one and the same. They partake of a common quality which we call *reverence*.

If a sentiment does not result from the excitement of emotions what then is the cause of it? The sentiment of love—and this is the only basic sentiment we can have—is due to our direct judgment of beauty. It is a function of our consciousness, a function of what McDougall vaguely describes as the 'most essential part of man' or the 'intimate self of man'. The self must perform this function always sometimes with one object and sometimes with an other. The object of the sentiment is the ideal. All the emotions exist already in our nature as parts of this function. The sentiment of self comes into existence simultaneously with the idea of self. Only our view of the object that is lovable to us continues to change throughout life. A sentiment is therefore 'determined by the course of experience in this sense only that with the growth of experience and knowledge the object of sentiment, that is, the ideal, becomes more and more perfect but the function of loving itself is 'natively given in the inherited constitution.' It is an innate quality of the self. No sentiment can 'decay completely without yielding place to an other because the self must perform its function of loving always. It cannot hold this function in check and therefore if it cannot love one object (because according to its judgment, it is lacking in beauty) it must love another object immediately. The self loves an object or an idea which appears to it to be

most beautiful at the time. From our earliest childhood till the last day of our life we are always ready to love the most admirable or lovable object or idea that we come to know of, from time to time. Judgments of beauty are made directly. They do not acquire and do not wait for, an excitement and much less a repeated excitement of emotions.

Since a sentiment is a characteristic of consciousness and since consciousness is free only in man therefore it is man alone who is capable of having a sentiment. It is true that some of the higher animals also appear to have sentiments but in the animal the brain is too incomplete to satisfy the needs of consciousness. It does not afford consciousness the freedom that it requires in order to perform its functions adequately. In the animal consciousness is suppressed and labours under material limitations which it has not yet been able to overcome. Therefore the sentiment of the animal (if at all we should use the word sentiment for it) is crude and incomplete, half-conscious and automatic. It is incapable of shifting to higher and higher ideas. It is more of the nature of an inflexible, inherited attitude and a developed and intensified instinct than of a love or a hatred that is capable of ruling the instincts consciously or of exciting all the emotions that are latent in a sentiment.

McDougall tries to prove his thesis that a sentiment results from the excitement of emotions by giving the example of a boy whose father displays his anger repeatedly before him in such way that the boy developes first of all what he calls a 'rudimentary sentiment' of fear which later on grows into a full-blown hatred by incorporating into itself other emotional dispositions which the detestable behaviour of the father is able to create.

Evidently this example is too convenient for the purpose of the writer. Even in this case the sentiment of love or the ideal existed before the emotion of fear was excited. But naturally, in view of the tender age and the limited

knowledge and experience of the boy, his ideal was very low in the scale of beauty; it was no other than the satisfaction of his 'instincts of attraction' itself. Therefore whoever stood in the way of a smooth satisfaction of these instincts, in other words, whoever was able to arouse the 'instincts of repulsion' was bound to become the object of the boy's hatred. It will be a mistake to derive, from this example, a general conclusion that hatred results from the excitement of emotions, because here too, the fundamental cause of the boy's hatred is an already existing love of which only the object is rather low in the standard of beauty. His hatred appeared in the service of a love that was already present. The repeated excitement of his fear resulted in hatred because it enabled the boy to judge his father as a person who had proved himself to be out of harmony and sympathy with what he loved and liked. If there had been no innate capacity in him to love certain things and he had not loved them, he would have never hated his father even if he had repeatedly aroused his fear. If the boy had grown sufficiently in years and had acquired a sufficient amount of self-knowledge he would have had a higher ideal and would have probably found reason to justify, excuse or explain the behaviour of his father in the light of that ideal. In that case his ideal would have controlled his instincts so that the father's behaviour would have neither excited his fear unduly nor induced his hatred.

Because our fears are excited by our ideals we revise them in the light of our ideals in order to ascertain whether they are well-founded or otherwise. We retain the fears that are based on a real threat to our ideal and give up all the others. It is not fear that creates the sentiment of hate but it is rather an already existing sentiment of love that arouses our fears and induces our hates at relevant occasions. A grown-up cultured man may not fear the boy's father on account of his repeated display of anger and yet may hate him because his behaviour offends the man's ideal of excellence. We hate whatever offends our ideals. Because

we love certain things we have to hate certain other things. The basis of our hatred is our innate desire to love the object that appears to us to be the most admirable and lovable whether it is our instinctive desires as in childhood or a standard of excellence as in the case of a grown-up cultured man.

McDougall thinks that a complete sentiment grows out of a rudimentary sentiment. But since a sentiment is not a gradually developing organization of emotions the distinction between a full-grown and a rudimentary sentiment is uncalled for. The capacity for love is innate, but the object of love continues to grow in perfection and uniqueness. What the writer calls a rudimentary sentiment can be no more than an emotional attitude resulting from a sentiment which is already present. Our principal love determines our smaller loves and hates. Love is not one sentiment but a system of sentiments. We love all those objects which favour our love and hate all those objects which thwart it. No subservient attitude of love or hate can grow in us unless it is permitted or required by our principal love or our ideal. It can grow only when an object favours or interferes whith our principal love. To say nothing of a so-called 'rudimentary sentiment' which according to McDougall is a growth out of an instinct, even an instinct cannot have its own way if its demand is contrary to the requirements of the ideal.

In man the emotions serve the ideal, in the animal they serve the physical body. The emotions connected with the instincts serve a biological purpose and become active when the needs of the body are either favoured or opposed. Their object is to start and sustain to its end the activity characteristic of the instinct in order to secure for the animal the preservation of his life and race. But in man these emotions are ultimately held in check, ruled and dominated by the ideal. In other words the emotions are excited in man ultimately, when the continuation of love and not the continuation of life is favoured, or opposed. When we are

living almost on the animal plane of life, as in the case of a child or a savage, our ideal is no higher than the satisfaction of our instinctive desires and consequently when these desires are favoured or thwarted our emotions are aroused. The cause of the excitement of emotions, even in this case, is our innate sentiment of love for an ideal. In the example cited by McDougall as long as the boy's ideal remains close to his instinctive desires, his loves and hates must remain confined to objects that favour or disfavour these desires and consequently it is these objects that must arouse his emotions. But as his ideal improves in perfection and rises above the instinctive desires he must learn to control his instincts more and more for the sake of his ideal. In a highly cultured man, a man who is deeply in love with a lofty ideal, it is ultimately the danger to the ideal rather than to the body that will arouse the emotion of fear. Similar is the case with other emotions like disgust, wonder, anger, subjection and elation, that are bound up with our animal instincts. They are kept under a strict control by the love of the ideal. It suffices as a proof of the fact that emotions are inseparable from love that even in the animal they serve a sort of love which is, however, not free like that of the human being but which is automatic and inflexible and takes the form of instincts. For, we know that every instinct of the animal is either an instinct of attraction or an instinct of repulsion.

The error of McDougall that a sentiment results from the excitement of emotions is, naturally, due to the fact that he regards the emotions as belonging primarily to our animal instincts of which according to him the human personality is entirely composed. He makes a distinction between the primary and the secondary emotions and says that the emotions connected with the instincts, that is, those which man possesses in common with the higher animals are primary and all others peculiar to man are derived from them as their combinations. But if emotions belong to the instincts how is it that they fail to combine into so-

called secondary or derived emotions in the case of animal as they do in the case of man? Why is it that man alone is able to exhibit so rich a variety of emotions and not the animal. Why is it again that emotions organize themselves into the form of sentiments only in the case of man and not in the case of the animal, although they are excited as frequently in the animal as in man. Reason, which is according to McDougall, the only distinction enjoyed by man over the animal, is certainly not responsible for this supposed chemical composition of instincts and emotions in man, on account of which the nature of man becomes so vastly different from that of the animal. To what else can we attribute these distinctive features of the human psychology?

The fact is that emotions belong fundamentally to consciousness, to what McDougall vaguely understands as 'the most essential part' of man or the 'intimate self' of man. They belong essentially and primarily to the man in us and not to the animal. The emotions connected with our animal instincts may be the most important for the preservation of life, but they are not primary in the sense that all the other emotions which it is possible for us to experience, represent their mixture or fusion in various shades or degrees. We have seen that it is not the instincts and their connected emotions that combine in various quantities to make consciousness but it is consciousness that has evolved the instincts to be what they are. What is primary and fundamental is consciousness and not the instinct. Instincts derive their existence as well as their character from consciousness. It was consciousness that built up the instincts in order to make a passage for itself and not the instincts that built up consciousness. Instincts are only some of the tendencies latent in consciousness, which become fixed and automatic, in a way, materialized to compel the half-conscious animal to preserve its life and race for the purposes of evolution. In the course of its struggle with matter consciousness left behind some of its own tendencies embedded in matter and passed on to its

own freedom. All emotions are therefore present in the nature of consciousness and consequently appear in their fullest richness and variety in man in whom consciousness has achieved its freedom.

Emotions belong to the sentiment, to the love in us which is a function of our consciousness. They do not create the sentiment but they are parts of the sentiment itself. They serve love. Love protects itself and continues its growth through them. They are the phases of love or the modes in which love expresses itself. They are included in love itself otherwise love would not cause their excitement. An emotion is the response of love to an event. To give expression to an emotion, whatever the emotion may be, is to love, to exercise the function of loving, in a manner suitable to the situation exciting the emotion.

Except when we indulge in a real and not a feigned laughter, we are always loving and therefore always expressing some emotion or another in a greater or a lesser degree. Laughter is the self's state of zero emotion when the self has a momentary respite from constant emotional demands of its love. The ideal of the self makes life a very serious business for it. It exerts upon it a pull of attraction, like the pressure of a spring in the mechanism of a wound-up clock, which keeps it constantly in a state of effort and emotional tension. Effort does not necessarily mean working or thinking hard. Even a state of ordinary rest is attended by emotions of some kind. A comic or non-serious situation excites laughter because it gives a momentary suggestion of the meaninglessness or the absence of the ideal, of love and of effort and emotion. Every situation which can give a suggestion of this kind whether on account of the peculiar temperament or attitude of the person noticing it or on account of its intrinsic character, tends to excite laughter. The effect of a suggestion of this kind is the immediate removal of the emotional tension of the self, resulting in laughter, as if a spring that was tightly

wound is suddenly released. That is why real laughter is peculiar to man who alone of all the species has a free consciousness capable of loving an ideal and expressing all the emotions, from zero onwards, latent in the nature of consciousness. When we are serious about life we are always passing through one emotion or another.

Emotions are events in the career of love; they indicate the circumstances through which love is passing. The reaction of love to each of these circumstances with a view to protect and to continue itself is an emotion. The object of all emotions is to drive the self towards the object of love and away from the object of hate. Emotions which have their source in hate are also aspects of love, since hate itself depends upon love. We hate for the sake of our love and we cannot love without hating.

When the course of love is running smoothly *i.e.*, when the object of love is being approached and the object of hate is being pushed back successfully, the attending emotion is joy, bliss or happiness and when the reverse is the case we have sorrow, some forms of which are despondency, despair and grief. The emotions range into innumerable varieties from sorrow to joy like the colours of a spectrum. Sorrow is due to the sense of a final failure to approach the beloved which includes the sense of the final loss of the beloved. The love persists in spite of this sense of failure or loss and this is the cause of sorrow. Sorrow is always due to an error of the self. The Beloved of the self, that is, Consciousness, is always alive and always approachable. For this reason sorrow cannot endure for long and ends gradually, in the case of a normal mind, in a reaction of hope which is due to the self's natural (for the time being, overshadowed or repressed) conviction of a permanent possibility of achieving its desire, coming to its own.

The view of McDougall that the human self is an edifice in which the bricks are the instincts does not give an adequate explanation of will. It is not easy to understand

how can it be possible for a man willingly to make big sacrifices involving the suppressing and checking of his instinctive desires and even the loss of his life for a sentiment of love which is itself at bottom no more than a group or a combination of instinctive desires and emotions which have for their object the preservation of life. The sentiment of love say of God, religion, country or nation which calls upon us sometimes to surrender our life cannot have the instincts as its basis, otherwise it will never seek its satisfaction at the cost of its own foundations. Indeed, the sentiment of love for the ideals which is the source of will rules the instincts and their emotions and it cannot do so if it is itself a creature of instincts.

Chapter VII

THE CURRENT THEORIES OF HUMAN NATURE—II

(FREUD & ADLER)

Freud deserves our gratitude for his splendid analysis of the human mental apparatus into its various realms or regions which he calls the id, the ego and the super-ego. Although he is sadly mistaken about the nature of the urge in the unconscious, which he regards as sexual, yet it appears that his general theory about the supreme importance of the unconscious as the dynamic power of human action, has laid the foundations of a far reaching progress in the knowledge of human nature. From our own point of view the unconscious urge of the human mind is for Beauty or Perfection and not for sex. His theory when purged of its principal error will accord almost completely with the theory of human nature already outlined in this book. The error of Freud has led him to a most unfortunate distortion of facts, as we shall presently see.

Briefly the theory of Freud is that a very small part of the human personality is above the level of consciousness, while the rest of it is below this level. The portion below is known as the 'unconscious mind' or simply the 'unconscious.' It is the larger as well as the more important portion of consciousness. All the contents of the conscious mind are derived from the unconscious and they are to the unconscious as foam is to the ocean. The unconscious self is uncivilized and intensely selfish. Its chief concern is to gratify its desires which are sexual in nature and which are tremendously powerful. It cannot satisfy its desires

except through the conscious self. Hence it forces the conscious self with the whole pressure of its desires to strive for their satisfaction.

The conscious self, which is really a creature of the unconscious, feels the necessity of meeting the needs of the unconscious but it is often helpless, because it is under a strong pressure from an opposite direction which requires it to behave in a respectable, law-abiding and orderly manner and that is the pressure of the society. Since the shameful and unruly desires of the unconscious interfere with the respectability and reputation of the conscious self the latter tries to check them and keep them below the level of consciousness. This function of the conscious self is called the *censor*. Unconscious desires which suffer continuous discouragement and repression from the censor are, in spite of their great and insistent power, finally disappointed and no longer insist on rising into consciousness, that is, they are forgotten. They, however, avenge themselves, so to say, for the rough treatment meted out to them, by creating a diseased condition of the mind, known as a complex, of which the symptoms are hysteria, nervousness, obession and neurosis. The psycho-analyst claims to cure these nervous diseases by merely bringing to light the repressed desires and thus altering their character. The repressed energy which is the cause of trouble is played off in this way. The censor, however, permits those desires to rise to consciousness which purify themselves enroute by a process which Freud denotes by the name of *sublimation*. Freud seems to hold that all contents of the conscious mind are sublimated versions of elements in the unconscious. This is true not only of our desires and aversions, hopes and aspirations but also of our ideals, beliefs, thoughts and tastes of all varieties.

In his later publications Freud uses the words *id* and *ego* respectively for the unconscious and the conscious selves. He used a third term, *super-ego* for a part or a function of the ego to which he allocates the activities of "self-observa-

tion, conscience and holding up of ideals". The super-ego pursues its own ends and is independent of the ego as regards the energy at its disposal. The ego is at the mercy of the super-ego which dictates to it sometimes very severe standards of morality. Our sense of guilt or sinfulness is the result of the tension between the ego and the super-ego. Unlike sexuality which exists from the very beginning the super-ego is a latter development and is the result of what Freud calls the Oedipus complex.

The sexual urge of the child results in his intense love for his parents, who dominate him by granting proofs of affection and by threats of punishment which create an anxiety in the child, because they suggest to him a loss of their love and because they must be feared also on their own account. The objective anxiety which the child develops in this way is the fore-runner of the latter moral anxiety. So long as the former is dominant there is neither conscience nor super-ego. When the child grows in years he succeeds in overcoming more and more the Oedipus complex and its place is taken up by the super-ego which thereforward observes, guides and threatens the ego in just the same way as the parents acted to the child before. The super-ego, differs from the parental authority in one respect. It takes up and continues its harshness and the preventive and punitive functions but not its loving care. Moreover its harshness need not be inherited at all from the parental authority. It is relentlessly harsh and severe in any case, no matter how lovingly the parents may have brought up the child, scrupulously avoiding punishments and threats of all kinds.

When the Oedipus complex passes away the child gives up the intense object cathexes which it has formed towards its parents and to compensate for the loss of object it identifies other objects or persons with its parents. The identification becomes intense in proportion as the object-cathexes lose their influence.

"The super-ego", writes Freud "does not attain to full

strength and development if the overcoming of the Oedipus complex has not been completely successful. . . . The super-ego also takes over the influence of those persons who have taken the place of the parents, that is to say, of persons who have been concerned in the child's up-bringing and *whom it has regarded as ideal models.* Normally, the super-ego is constantly becoming more and more *remote from the original parents*, becoming as it were *impersonal.* Another thing that we must not forget is that *the child values its parents differently at different periods of its life.* At the time at which the Oedipus complex makes way for the super-ego, they seem to be *splendid figures*, but later on they *lose a good deal of their prestige*. . . . We have to mention another important activity which is to be ascribed to the super-ego. It is also the vehicle of the ego-ideal by which the ego measures itself, towards which it strives and *whose demands for ever increasing perfection it is always striving to fulfil.* No doubt this ego-ideal is a precipitation of the old idea of parents, an expression of *the admiration* which the child felt for *the perfection which it at that time ascribed to them*. . . . The super-ego is the representation of all moral restrictions, *the advocate of the impulse towards perfection.* In general parents and similar authorities follow the dictates of their own super-ego in the upbringing of their children. . . . The result is that the super-ego of the child is not really built up on the model of the parents but on that of the parents' super-ego."

Now something about the nature of the conscious and the unconscious minds which Freud calls the ego and the id.

The unconscious or the id is a cauldron of seething excitement. It has "no organization and no unified will, only an impulsion to obtain satisfaction for the instinctual needs in accordance with the pleasure principle. The laws of logic above all, the laws of contradiction—do not hold for processes in the id. Contradictory impulses exist side by side without neutralizing each other. . . . There is noth-

ing in the id which can be compared to negation and we are astonished to find in it an exception to the philosopher's assertion that space and time are necessary parts of our acts. In the id there is nothing corresponding to the idea of time, no recognition of the passage of time and (a thing which is very remarkable and awaits adequate attention in philosophic thought) no alteration of mental processes by the passage of time. Conative impulses which have never got beyond the id, and even impressions which have been pushed down to the id by repression are virtually immortal and are preserved for whole decades as though they had but recently occurred."

"Id knows no values, no good and evil, no morality." The ego may be regarded as "that part of the id which has been modified by its proximity to the external world and the influence that the latter has had on it. . . . The ego has taken over the task of representing the external world for the id and so of saving it, for the id blindly striving to gratify its instincts in complete disregard of the superior strength of outside forces could not otherwise escape annihilation. . . . In popular language we may say that *ego stands for reason and circumspection while id stands for the untamed passions* . . . . The ego is after all only a part of the id, a part purposely modified by its proximity to the dangers of reality. From a dynamic point of view it is weak, *it borrows its energy from the id*. . . . By identifying itself with the object it recommends itself to the id in place of the object and *seeks to attract the libido of the id on to itself*. . . . On the whole the ego has to carry out the intentions of the id, it fulfils its duty, if it succeeds in creating the conditions under which these intentions can be best fulfilled. One might compare the relations of the ego to the id with that between a rider and his horse. The horse provides the locomotive energy and the rider has the prerogative of determining the goal and of guiding the movements of his powerful mount towards it. But all too often in the relations between the ego and the id we find a picture of

the less ideal situation in which the rider is obliged to guide his horse in the direction in which it itself wants to go. . . ."

"The proverb tells us that one cannot serve two masters at once. The poor ego has a still harder time of it; it has to serve three harsh masters and has to do its best to reconcile the claims and demands of all three. *These demands are always divergent* and often seem quite incompatible; no wonder that the ego so frequently gives way under its task. The three tyrants are the external world the super-ego and the id. . . . It (the ego) is designed to represent the demands of the external world but it also wishes to be a loyal servant of the id, to remain upon good terms with the id, to recommend itself to the id as an object and to draw the id's libido on to itself. In its attempt to mediate between the id and the reality it is often forced to clothe the unconscious commands of the id with its own rationalisations, to gloss over the conflicts between the id and the reality and with diplomatic dishonesty to display a pretended regard for reality even when the id persists in being stubborn and uncompromising. On the other hand its every movement is watched by the severe super-ego which holds up certain norms of behaviour, without regard to any difficulties coming from the id and the external world and if these norms are not acted up to, it punishes the ego with the feelings of tension which manifest themselves as a sense of *inferiority* and *guilt*. In this way goaded on by the id hemmed in by the super-ego and rebuffed by reality the ego struggles to cope with its economic task of reducing the forces and influences which work in it and upon it to some kind of harmony and we may well understand how it is that we so often cannot repress the cry, 'Life is not easy'. When the ego is forced to acknowledge its weakness it breaks out into anxiety, reality anxiety in face of the external world, moral anxiety in face of the super-ego and neurotic anxiety in face of the strength of passions in the id".

Since according to Freud man is vicious by nature being

swayed by an unlimited and passionate sexual desire, he is compelled to deny that our higher activities like art, science, religion or philosophy have any intrinsic worth or merit of their own. He has tried to show in his book '*Civilization and its Discontents*' that these activities are attempts of man to compensate for his unsatisfied sexual desires. They are no more than a useful sop for salving his wounded instincts. They have their root in the evil nature of man which he is unable to express in an undisguised form. Conscience is the result of instinctual renunciations. Its verdict is based on the nature of instincts which society feels to be most dangerous to it. Religion is a desire for a heavenly father necessitated when the earthly father fails us in youth. Ethics and morality are barriers imposed by society to hold in check the undesirable instincts. Reasoning of all kinds is rationalising and a compensation for the instincts that are denied expression. We prove things to be true when we want them to true. Art is needed "to create illusions" and to protect man against the unbearable reality of things. "These illusions are derived from the life of phantasy". "At the head of these phantasy pleasures stands the enjoyment of works of art". Art is "a mild marcotic", a temporary "refuge from the hardships of life". Intellectual activity is also a compensation for thwarted instinctive desires. Our views on abstract questions, on right and wrong are determined by the instinctive desires whose substitute gratification is being sought. The evil impulses of man, according to Freud create a big necessity for him to delude himself by means of the "so called" higher activities that they are being satisfied, without satisfying them actually, in order to be able to pacify an oppressive society. The higher activities are not higher but they are unreal and illusory substitutes for our real desires. In short man must choose one of the following three alternatives :—

(1) To give full expression to the shameful urge of his nature and become as wicked and licentious as he desires. Of course the society will inflict disgrace,

degradation and censure upon him but let him try not to mind these things if he can.

(2) To repress his sexual desires in order to be able to please the society and thereby expose himself to the danger of suffering from nervousness, hysteria, obsessions, worries, neurosis and madness.

(3) To renounce his instinctive desires and try to deceive himself by such substitute activities as art, religion, science and morality which, he must remember, are, as a matter of fact, no more than illusions devoid of any merit or worth of their own.

Obviously Freud portrays a very miserable picture of human being. He depicts him as an intellectual beast doomed to disgrace, misery or madness if he does not deceive himself by using all his intellectual powers that the desires of his intractable evil nature are being satisfied.

But matters need not be as thoroughly bad as he has represented them to be. The apparently distorted and disappointing view of Freud about the lot of man and the value and worth of our higher activities is necessitated by his hypothesis that the nature of our unconscious desires is sexual. If this hypothesis is absurd, as we shall endeavour to show that it really is, the conclusions derived from it must be also absurd. In fact his conclusions cast a further suspicion on the validity of his basic assumption because when engaged in our higher activities we do not feel that we are deceiving ourselves, or that our pleasure is an illusion. If this had been the case Freud himself would not have devoted the whole of his life to the search for truth.

The passages of Freud quoted above from his '*New Introductory Lectures*' require only a small modification in order to suit the hypothesis that Beauty or Perfection and not sexuality is the urge of the id.

We shall attempt to show that this hypothesis makes the whole theory of the unconscious simple and intelligible. Not only does it fit in with all the facts eminently but also explains many things which were unintelligible to Freud.

Above all it reconciles the conflicting schools of psycho-analysis.

Freud has given an unjustifiably and even a ridiculously wide meaning to the word sexuality. From the beginning the ordinary man has believed on the grounds of experience that the sex instinct first manifests itself in adolescence except in the case of some precocious children who are considered as diseased and abnormal. The urge of the unconscious mind is of a permanent nature and in order to give the sex instinct the status of a permanent urge, which remains active from the first day of life to the last, Freud has tried to prove its activity from the earliest childhood by suggesting that such simple activities of the child as swallowing, secreting, sucking the nipple or the thumb are sexual in character. He holds that the child's love for his parents is due to his sexual urge. The child develops a sexual attitude towards the parent of the opposite sex and simultaneously a rivalry towards the other. This he calls the Oedipus complex. When the attitude of the child is the reverse of this Freud suggests that the Oedipus complex, although still sexual in nature, has become inverted. He believes that the function of the sex instinct is not as simple in man as it is in the animal. In man it consists of various component parts that have to fuse into a single whole and often fail to do so. In man moreover, it has to pass through two periods of development, one commencing from about the age of four and the second beginning just above the age of puberty. In the interval there is the "latency period" during which there is no progress.

Freud assigns a sexual origin not only to all mental and nervous disorders and dreams but also to normal mental processes that have apparently nothing to do with sex. He thinks that the love of ideals which the child develops later on, is also of a sexual origin, because it is the substitute of the Oedipus complex which disappears gradually yielding place to the love of ideals. Freud makes the Oedipus complex as the very foundation of his whole theory. Ernest

Jones writes about it: "All other conclusions of psycho-analytical theory are grouped around this complex and by the truth of this finding psycho-analysis stands or falls".

The idea of infantile sexuality, supported as it is by fantastic arguments, although fundamental to the theory of Freud, has failed to carry conviction with serious students of psychology. Freud was accused of being 'sex-mad' of 'reducing everything to sex' or of 'pan-sexualism'. The worst criticism of psycho-analysis has centred around this point. This is in fact the rock on which the school of psycho-analysis was shattered into three parties. Adler and Jung the co-workers and pupils of Freud found it difficult to agree with their master that the nature of the urge in the sub-conscious was sexual and advanced their own theories about it. Adler maintains that this urge is the impulse to power while Jung seems to hold that it is for both power and sex. The great amount of disagreement that exists among the psychologists in this respect, at least creates a suspicion that none of their theories is perfectly satisfactory and that there is room enough for a fresh theory explaining the nature of the unconscious urge in an entirely different way.

The clue to a different theory is afforded by some of the facts which were observed by Freud himself but of which the true significance he was unable to realize.

We gather from the quotations given above from the writings of Freud that the child loves his parents as 'splendid figures,' that he feels an 'admiration' for his parents and ascribes a 'perfection' to them, that he loves his teachers because they are 'ideal models,' that the super-ego (which is a name given by Freud to the mental function causing the love of ideals and which takes the place of the parents' love) 'is the advocate of the impulse towards perfection,' and that the super-ego demands 'an ever-increasing perfection.' Is it then too much to say that an individual is under the powerful influence of a desire for the perfect, the admirable and the splendid, throughout his life? In

childhood this desire finds an outlet in the persons of the parents and teachers because nothing more perfect and more admirable than them is known to the child. As his knowledge increases he finds other and better objects and ideas worthy of love and devotion and he is naturally attracted by them being compelled by the urge of his nature. The super-ego appears to be demanding an ever-increasing perfection of ideals because the child's idea of perfection improves as he grows in years and develops his powers of comparison and thought. His idea of what is perfect grows with knowledge and shifts to better and better objects continuously. This explains why, as the child grows, the parents 'lose a good deal of their prestige', why the 'super-ego is becoming more and more remote from the original parents,' why it is becoming more and more 'impersonal', and why the child 'values his parents differently at different periods of his life.' This urge is the cause of the so-called 'Oedipus complex' as well as of the 'impulse towards perfection' of which according to Freud the super-ego is 'the advocate.' Super-ego is not the result of the child's love of parents. On the other hand both the love of parents and the super-ego are the result of the urge for Perfection in the unconscious.

To my mind, one of the weakest links in the theory of Freud is his assertion, which he mistakes for an argument, that the super-ego or the mental function responsible for the love of ideals is the substitute of the Oedipus complex in the sense that the former is caused by the latter and is dependent upon it. He skips over the difficulty of proving that it is so and yet assumes it as a fact secure enough to serve him as the very foundation of his theory.

The fundamental attitude of parents towards the child is that of love. Their occasional harshness is also due to love, and the child fully appreciates this fact when he comes of age. If the super-ego is the heir of the parental function, why is it that it inherits from that function only harshness (expressed in the rebukes and reproaches of conscience) and

nothing of its love and tenderness? Moreover, the super-ego is harsh even if the parents have never been harsh to the child on account of their extreme fondness for him. Why is it that the super-ego inherits nothing whatsoever from the parental function in such cases? The Oedipus complex has two aspects—the child loves the parents and also fears them. His fear is the result of his love. What he fears principally is not punishment but the loss of love. Why then does a grown up man fear the super-ego or the ideal and act up to the standards prescribed by it when it does not pay back this effort in terms of love or affection like that of the parents. Why is it that the Oedipus complex in spite of its alleged sexual origin takes such a turn in later life as to emerge in a form which has no relation whatsoever with sex, that is, in the form of a conscience or an ideal of conduct? Freud tells us that the super-ego has a tendency to diverge more and more from the Oedipus complex as time goes on. Why so? If it had been a successor of the Oedipus complex we should have expected it to conform as much as possible to the character of its origin. Again sometimes the super-ego prescribes ideals which are not only different from, but also opposed to the wishes and desires of the parents. These facts are inexplicable if we assume that the love of ideals is not an independent natural urge in man but is the resulting substitute of the so-called Oedipus complex.

Freud himself writes :—

> "I cannot tell you as much as I could wish about the change from the parental function to the super-ego....partly because we ourselves do not feel we have fully understood it".*

The change from the parental function to the super-ego is not clear to Freud because of his persistence at all costs in the belief that the desires in the unconscious mind are of a sexual nature. He could not ascribe a sexual basis

*"New Introductory Lectures", Freud, p. 85.

to the urge for the ideals without asserting that the super-ego is the result of the Oedipus complex which has a sexual nature. This is no doubt a far-fetched idea.

Here there was a sufficient ground to expect that the cause of the super-ego may not be the accident of the Oedipus complex but something deep down in the nature of man in which we may discover the cause of the Oedipus complex as well. But unfortunately Freud missed the clue and lodged himself into difficulties. All the above facts are explained easily when we assume that the unconscious urge is for Beauty and Perfection and the super-ego is the representation or interpretation of the desires of the id by the ego. The love of ideals is directly caused by the pressure of the unconscious desire for perfection and beauty and is a natural function of the mind independent of the so-called 'Oedipus complex' which is itself caused by it. The unconscious urge for perfection or beauty is permanent. It functions in childhood as well as throughout the rest of the life of an individual. It finds satisfaction in various objects ranging from the parents and teachers to the highest ideals depending upon the stage up to which the ego has developed its knowledge of the perfect at any time. This hypothesis explains the cause of infantile repressions and thereby dispenses with the highly-disputed theory of infantile sexuality which Freud has advanced as an explanation of such repressions.

Freud stretches our imagination rather too much when he explains the child's love for his parents as due to sexuality. It is indeed possible that the child may sometimes love the parent of the opposite sex slightly more than the other parent, but it may be largely due to the fact that the parent of the opposite sex loves the child more than the other parent does and the child merely returns this extra attachment on his or her part. We may even concede that there may be an increased attachment for the parent of the opposite sex on the part of the child even on account of his own sex inclinations particularly in precocious

children but the fact that the child generally loves both his parents almost to the same extent and sometimes the parent of the same sex more than the parent of the opposite sex and that the child may love other persons too like teachers, etc., who are concerned in his up-bringing and whom he regards as perfect and admirable irrespective of their sex, does point to a source of love in him which should be different from sexuality. Obviously the child's love is turning on some internal desire for perfection, which cannot but find an outlet in the persons of his parents and teachers for the time being.

The ego forms an ideal at every stage of its life and the nature and the standard of perfection of its ideal depends upon the amount of knowledge and experience it has gained at any particular time. Naturally, on account of the child's limited knowledge and his proximity to some superior, authoritative and affectionate persons (whom he understands as his parents and teachers) he cannot think of any other models of perfection, love and goodness except them. This first ideal of the child has to be given up by him quite naturally as his knowledge increases and he comes to know of certain other objects, persons or ideas more satisfactory than this. The urge of the id is to love the best that is lovable, to love the object of the highest beauty and perfection known to the self at any time, be it the parents, the teachers or the ideals of ever-increasing perfection.

But the question arises if the unconscious urge is for beauty or perfection and not sex, how are we to explain the fact that Freud actually discovered in his experiments that some of his nervous patients were actually suffering from sex repressions or that the treatment to which they were subjected on this assumption actually brought about the cure in very many cases ?

It can be explained as follows :—

Attraction, love, or the search for Beauty is the principal urge of consciousness and this urge has been

manifesting itself at every stage of evolution in a manner suitable to and consistent with that stage. There is every truth in the Biblical saying that 'God is Love'. Hate or repulsion is the negative aspect of this urge. It indicates a direction opposite to that in which life is moving, opposite to that of love. Consciousness has made use of its own urge of attraction and its opposite repulsion for pushing itself through every stage of its own evolution. Both attraction and repulsion have been essential for the progress of life at every stage and they will remain essential for the future progress of life as well. These two tendencies in some form or shape form the characteristics of all life. In the material stage life developed the physical laws which can be explained as various forms of attraction and repulsion. We see the evidence of it in the affinities of atoms, in a chemical action, in the attraction between the opposite poles of magnets, or the opposite charges of electricity, in the force of gravitation and in all fundamental properties of matter. In the animal stage life evolved the instincts. All instincts are similarly fashioned by life out of its own urge for love and its antithesis hate.

While other instincts share the principal urge of consciousness, that is, its urge of love for beauty, by implication and as tendencies subservient to it, a part of the sex instinct—that part on account of which the animal is first attracted to the mate and made available for the latter sexual act—is fashioned directly out of this urge. In the operation of the sex instinct, that is, the initial part is played by the attraction for the beautiful. When in the course of evolution the instinct passes on to man in whom the urge of consciousness comes into its own for the first time and gains the freedom to seek the real and the final object of its desire, viz. Beauty or Consciousness, the instinct acquires a force and a meaning which it did not possess in the animal stage.

Sex instinct is to be found in both man and animal but

it does not cause nervous diseases in the animal, because there it functions with its normal strength. But in man, in the period of adolescence in particular, the instinct of sex gets an influx of energy from the urge of consciousness which seeks beauty and is therefore too ready to flow into the channel of the sex instinct (which is fashioned out of the urge for beauty) and to express itself erroneously in the love of the mate. The very first joy of love which a man or a woman feels for his or her mate is not sexual in character. It is spiritual as can be understood from the nature of the pleasure attending it, which is akin to the pleasure we derive from the contemplation of a beautiful work of art. The pleasure derived from sex gratification is of a different quality. The idea of sex comes later on when the first, spiritual sort of attraction, has served its purpose of bringing together the male and the female. When on account of the proximity of the male and the female, sex instinct becomes active, the original spiritual joy makes room for the lower sexual pleasure.

Nature has no doubt utilised the larger desire for beauty in all life, the principal quality of attraction in consciousness, for attracting the male and the female towards each other for the procreation of the race. This is to be found not only in man but also in birds and insects, in whom the beauty of colour, song or plumage is the agency which attracts the male to the female. The sex desire is initiated by a desire for beauty. When the urge of consciousness is not having its own expression, a man feels a sort of repression on account of the force of the unconscious desire for Beauty and it appears to him that he can relieve himself by free sexual indulgence, but such a laxity is really harmful to him as the urge that really seeks expression is that of consciousness and not of sex. We know that the urge of self generally does not know the real object that can satisfy it and commits mistakes frequently. If the self is not already familiar with its own ideal it mistakes the first attraction for the mate, in adolescence in particular,

as the most satisfactory object and gives itself up completely to it, the urge of self having a full expression in it for the time being. But since the mate cannot be the real object of the self's desire, the love of self is unable to run a smooth course and before long there is disillusionment and disappointment and sometimes a serious mental conflict and nervous disorder.

It appears to us as if the repression of the sex urge is the cause of all these miseries, but really their cause is the obstruction of the urge of consciousness which is for Beauty, Goodness and Perfection. That is why people disappointed in love find satisfaction in higher and altruistic activities and ultimately forget their love disappointments and that is why people devoted to such activities are able to control easily their sex desires. People who are trained to give suitable expression to their urge of self need not suffer from mental conflicts or nervous diseases at all. All our interest in stories of love, in fiction, novels, poetry and drama is due to the urge of self finding as expression in sex love, and thereby giving the latter a special meaning and importance. Life is made by the urge of self and not by the urge of sex.

The arrangement of nature by which the sex instinct happens to share something of the urge of consciousness, that is, something of the spiritual, serves a useful purpose, as the peculiar joy that a man or a woman feels in the smooth course of his or her first attraction for the mate, which has not yet been replaced by the inferior kind of pleasure derived from the actual sexual act that follows this attraction, makes the self familiar with the nature of the joy that will be experienced by it in the love of consciousness and therefore serves as a guide and a stimulant to the urge of self. When a man has once experienced the joy of an intense, pure and sincere love for a woman and when being ultimately disillusioned after a failure or a success, he wants to replace it by the love of his Creator through a course of prayers and devotions, he succeeds more readily than a man who has never gone through an experience of intense

love. He discovers soon that a joy similar to his previous joy but surpassing it by far in quality and intensity, is animating him gradually more and more.

To love sincerely and passionately is a great virtue, whatever the object of love. It gives a free and full expression, at least once in our life, to an urge which we need most of all to express. Such a love is bound to end in an intense love for the Creator. The fact that the urge of self gets mixed up with the urge of sex explains why Freud erroneously regards the sex instinct in man as complicated and composed of various parts which have to fuse into an entity but seldom do so. If the urge of id had been sex, the free sex indulgence should have given us a complete satisfaction while actually it makes us miserable in the long run because we feel that we have ignored and violated our ideal. The ideal satisfies one aspect of our desire for Beauty and the sex love, if a part of the urge of consciousness is finding expression through it, satisfies another, but at the same time the sex love comes into a clash with our desire for the ideal. This gives rise to a mental conflict because we want to satisfy two conflicting desires at once. These desires are really a single desire and are meant to be satisfied by a single object of love, the Divine Self, but we make them two desires because we are not able to see the whole of beauty in our ideal for the time being and feel in a hurry to satisfy them at once. Complete satisfaction can come to us only when our ideal is able to satisfy the whole of the urge of consciousness for Beauty and that is possible only when we are able to feel increasingly the Beauty of Consciousness, the Perfect Ideal.

Nervous disorders are caused by the obstruction of the urge of consciousness and not by the repression of the urge of sex which in its unmixed form is no more than a biological function as simple and harmless as in the lower animals. But frequently, and in youth in particular, the urge of consciousness finds an expression in the love of the mate, so that the sex attraction is tremendously enhanced. The

disorders, will be caused whenever the urge of self is suppressed or obstructed on account of the wrong choice of the ideal or on account of insufficient vision, impression or appreciation of the beauty of the Right Ideal. We are miserable whenever our desire for an ideal cannot find a full expression, whether the ideal is a mate or duty or the approval and admiration of society, sought through position, power or anything else.

What causes the worry or the nervous trouble is that the whole of the love of self is not being utilised by the ideal and a portion of it is being attracted by one of the instinctive desires making what is really one desire into two conflicting desires pulling the self in opposite directions. This happens when the ideal lacks intrinsic beauty or when its beauty is not sufficiently realised. All individuals having the same ideal do not love it equally. The beauty of the same ideal is felt differently by different persons at the same time and by the same person at different times. It is important to note that sex is not the only impulse that competes with the ideal in the case of a mental conflict. Sex instinct is only one of so many other instincts which come into a clash with the impulse for the ideal. The conflict may be caused equally by other impulses when they are competing with the ideal and dividing a portion of the self's love. The shell-shock cases in the first and second world-wars were due to the instinct of self-preservation vying with the ideal or the love of duty.

The conflict can be made impossible by increasing our love for the ideal whatever the ideal may be.

But there can be no love unless there is faith, which means a feeling or vision of the ideal's beauty and this ultimately depends upon what intrinsic beauty the ideal has. The nearer an ideal is to Beauty or Consciousness the greater the possibility of our loving it completely and constantly.

A patriotic soldier risks his life in the battle-field because he is convinced that it is his duty to do so. Duty is

the call of the ideal and his ideal is his country. He desires to perform his duty because he loves his ideal. It depends on the strength of his love how far he will go in risking his life and performing his duty. If his attraction for the ideal is very great, that is, if he has really a vision of the ideal's beauty, the desire to perform his duty will be strong enough to oust all other desires, including his desire to preserve his life. If on the other hand his attraction for the ideal is weak, some of the urge of self will find expression in the love of life and there will be a conflict between two desires, one for the ideal goading him to lay down his life and the other for the preservation of life itself, goading him to run away. The conflict will reach its maximum when the shell bursts near the soldier resulting in what is known as a shell shock.

The soldier has no faith in the ideal probably because the ideal has no permanent value for him. He thinks, for example, that all will end with his death and he will not be rewarded for losing his life. In such a case his ideal is imperfect and lacks the qualities of Beauty one of which is permanence so that the soldier is unable to be deceived by it. The Right Ideal, since it contains all the qualities that we desire (that being precisely the reason why it is the Right Ideal) is capable of attracting us in such a way that no instinctive desire is able to compete with it and make a conflict possible.

If, on the other hand, the soldier's attraction to the ideal of his country is very great, he will readily lay down his life for it and will fight willingly while the shells are breaking all around him. He will not suffer from a shell-shock because his urge for Beauty is being satisfied completely by a single ideal throughout. In such a case, although his ideal is imperfect yet, in his error, he invests it with all the qualities of the Perfect Ideal. He is mistaken. He may be deceiving himself, for example, by persuading the belief that he will become immortal by sacrificing his life for his country or that he wants nothing besides the

good of his countrymen which will be permanently achieved by fighting to death.

Let us take another example in which the sex impulse is involved.

Supposing an orderly and law-abiding man falls in love with the wife of his neighbour. The approval of society is the ideal of his life and he loves this ideal. His ego interprets beauty in the form of this ideal and hence all his actions are dictated by it. If his attraction for the ideal is strong enough it will succeed in curbing all other desires, which come into a clash with it including his love for the woman. If his love for the ideal is not sufficiently strong a portion of the urge of consciousness will find expression in the sexual impulse towards the woman. What was really one desire, for the Right Ideal, will be thus split up into two desires, opposite and conflicting in their nature, one for the approval of the society and the other for the woman's love. The result will be a mental conflict and a dissociation of the mind manifesting itself in a nervous disorder. The trouble is caused by the fact that the man lacks sufficient faith in his ideal. He fears his ideal on account of his long attachment to it and yet thinks that it will be unable to reward him sufficiently for the sacrifice of his sexual impulse. The psycho-therapist and the patient are both to be excused if they think that the nervous trouble is caused by the repression of the sexual impulse because the apparent circumstances are such, but the real cause of the trouble is that his ideal is incapable of giving the fullest expression to his urge for beauty. He cannot love his ideal as much as his nature wants him to live it. He will be cured if we manage to increase his love for the existing ideal that is, his regard for the approval of the society or if he can no longer be deceived by his ideal and considers it very low in the scale of beauty, by making him feel the beauty of a higher, more beautiful and more attractive ideal which requires good intentions towards one's neighbours and which is capable of monopolizing the whole of his love, say the love of the

Creator. The ideal which is capable of absorbing the whole of our love permanently without deceiving us is the Right Ideal, and the love of that alone can make nervous diseases impossible.

The psycho-therapist may tell the man to give up his repressions and have a liaison with the woman. But this will be a most dangerous advice and a very harmful method of treatment. It will make him worse. The doctor will diminish the patient's love for his ideal of society's approval and reduce its beauty in his eyes, so that for a short time the whole of the urge of his self will run into his sexual impulse and the woman will become his sole ideal. *In this* way the conflict will disappear temporarily but, since the woman cannot fill the place of the ideal in his heart permanently, the man will be as a matter of fact preparing himself for a bigger trouble. When his sex impulse is satisfied, it will lose its charm and the man will find that it is unable to satisfy the whole of his urge of self for perfection. He will therefore return for the full satisfaction of this urge to his ideal and find it wounded and violated. This will make the man extremely dissatisfied with himself and therefore extremely miserable. This is another conflict which may be serious enough to drive the man to suicide. It is only a foolish psycho-therapist who will treat his patient by asking him to give up his repressions in this way.

In the case of a mental conflict the urge of our self is divided into two parts and, by playing the libertine, we express one part of it but suppress the other which is the more important part, ultimately, and therefore make ourselves worse. The desire to be moral is not the result of social pressure but it is caused by our inner urge for beauty. It is the complete expression of this urge that can cure a neurosis. We are afraid of the society because we identify beauty with the approval of the society, and we can not get rid of this fear by the persuasions of a half-witted doctor unless we see a greater beauty and thus form a greater

attachment elsewhere. The neurotic person suffers not because he is unable to reconcile himself to society and its standards but because he is unable to reconcile himself to himself. His *libido* is always compelling him to seek beauty and he cannot quarrel with it. He suffers from a conflict when, owing to the error of the ego, it appears to him that he can satisfy the *libido* by two opposite impulses.

The soldier who suffered from shell-shock could save himself by running away from the battle-field but the desire for beauty, which takes the form of the society's approval in his case, holds him to his post. He prefers the satisfaction of his urge for beauty to the preservation of his life. If the pressure had not been internal, he could have easily given it up and made himself comfortable. He cannot be happy by breaking lose from the standards imposed by the society because the approval of the society satisfies his desire for beauty. A respectable man cannot indulge in sexual laxity for the same reason. Libertinism starves the desire for beauty instead of satisfying it. The desire for Beauty is much too large to be satisfied by sexual indulgence. The sex instinct in its pure form is capable of being satisfied completely like every other instinct but the desire for Beauty is infinite and insatiable. Patriotism is really the last resort of scoundrels in some cases. The reason is that the man who has led the life of a rake and has continually thwarted his urge for Beauty wants to compensate for the wrong he has done to himself by resorting to higher altruistic activities—in which his urge for Beauty can find a natural expression.

The fact that free sexual indulgence cannot cure a neurosis is a further indication that our unconscious urge is not of a sexual nature, otherwise sexual gratification should have proved an effective cure for it.

Is the pleasure derived from our higher activities an illusion?

Freud admits that we derive a joy and a pleasure from our higher activities. This pleasure is sometimes much

greater than the pleasure derived from the satisfaction of those desires of which these activities are alleged to be illusory substitutes. The question arises why should our natural instinctive desires become at all transformed into a shape entirely different from their original character and why should they yield us any pleasure at all when they have thus changed their nature? How is it that the higher activities, that is, the activities of which the object is the search for Beauty, Goodness and Truth, alone, in exclusion to all others, are capable of taking the place of the renounced instinctive desires and of giving us a satisfaction enough to serve as a substitute for the abandoned satisfaction of our instincts and even more. There must be some reason for it inherent in our nature.

The fact does not seem to have been sufficiently realized that nothing (unless it is an abnormal and diseased activity which can be surely distinguished from a normal and healthy activity of the higher type like art, philosophy or science) can please or satisfy us if it does not meet a direct demand of our nature, and that it can please or satisfy us only to the extent to which it meets that demand. We cannot sublimate our desire for food into a desire for reading or playing permanently. Our higher activities no doubt satisfy a natural, independent and direct desire for Beauty a desire which is sur ing like a stormy ocean in the unconscious mind and which is often misrepresented by the ego as sexual or other desires. They are not caused by the sublimated versions of our sexual desires but rather by the original, normal desires of the self, which like all our natural desires press for satisfaction and give pleasure when satisfied. The pleasure derived from the satisfaction of these desires is so comprehensive that we forget our lower desires. Unfortunately, Freud has reversed the reality. He regards the normal and real desires of the unconscious as unreal and the desires which are the abnormal mistaken representations by the ego of the real desires of the unconscious *e.g.* the exaggerated sexual desires, are considered by him as real.

The phenomenon of 'sublimation' in the sense of a transformation of desires does not exist. What happens in the so-called 'sublimation' is not that our lower desires are converted or transformed into higher desires, as if by a feat of magic, but it is that we begin to satisfy our natural higher desires in such a way that on account of the satisfaction derived from them we are able to neglect or ignore the lower desires successfully. We know that our instincts are fashioned out of the urge of self. They are tendencies which exist already in the nature of consciousness. Consequently when we manage to satisfy the urge of consciousness properly, that is, when moral action or worship or the pursuit of art, knowledge or science becomes, a source of real pleasure to us, we get a satisfaction alternative and parallel to the satisfaction we get from the instinctive desires and the pressure of the latter, is reduced to a minimum. They are no longer a source of trouble to us and if we choose we can neglect them easily, of course, some of them more easily than others, depending in some degree, upon the character and shape of the higher activity in which we are engaged. Neglect makes these instinctive desires still weaker till ultimately they appear to have ceased to exist.

Because every instinctive tendency has a second life in the urge of self, by a full satisfaction of this urge, we secure a substitute satisfaction for the abandoned satisfaction of the instincts. The desires prompting our higher activities are always there but we neglect them owing to an error and try (never successfully) to get all the joy and pleasure that their satisfaction can bring us, from the satisfaction of our lower instinctive desires. In the case of so-called 'sublimation' the lower desires are brought well under control because the urge of self is having its proper satisfaction.

The assumption that Beauty and not sex is the urge of the unconscious, therefore explains the satisfaction derived from higher activities and their capacity to relieve the repression and bring peace to the mind. What is more, it

removes all the divergence and incompatibility between the id, the super-ego and the 'reality' on account of which Freud had imagined the lot of man to be so miserable. On this view we understand, more-over, that man is thoroughly good by nature. He need not be miserable nor suffer from nervous diseases if he rightly understands his unconcious urge. The demand of the id is not the satisfaction of its strong untamed sexual passions. Its only passion, which is of course, very strong, is the love of the Truly Beautiful.

The ego represents the outside world to the id for the satisfaction of its desires. The id demands the satisfaction of its desires but being out of contact with the outside world it does not know how these desires can be fulfilled. The ego interprets these desires and tries to satisfy them as best as it can. It is the agent of the id and looks around for beauty and tries to achieve it for the satisfaction of the id. The task which the id entrusts to the ego is very great and difficult since it has only a vague knowledge of what the id really wants. The ego tries its best to perform this service as ably and as efficiently as it can. It makes the wisest conjectures and estimates of its desires that it can. This function of the ego is the super-ego. The conjectures of the ego are the ideals. The continuous, strenuous efforts of the ego in this direction have created the whole of our history and all the knowledge that we have. The ego is always busy in searching for the object that is most satisfactory to the id. The reason is that for this service to the id it expects a great reward which is the enjoyment of friendship and terms of peace with the id and this is its greatest desire. In addition to that, it expects its own enlargement and extension and a share in the power of the id which is very great. Should the ego perform its service correctly it will get happiness and power in return for it.

The only knowledge of the object desired by the id with which the ego starts on its great search is that this object will satisfy the id perfectly and that it is something

great and beautiful. With such a scanty knowledge the ego is bound to err frequently and its first error is that which Freud calls the Oedipus complex; the ego takes the parents for the model of all excellence and beauty. The error works well for a number of years, but as the ego develops its knowledge, the parents seem to it to be less and less satisfactory to the id. Then the ego recommends other objects to the id. Frequently it identifies with Beauty objects which are really lacking in the qualities of Beauty and which consequently do not satisfy the strong passions of the id in the long run. The urge of the id is very strong and therefore the id feels extremely disappointed and discontented when the super-ego identifies itself with wrong ideals which do not relieve the urge of the id and do not give it a permanent happiness.

Every time that the ego makes a fresh choice, however erroneous it may be, it sincerely believes that it has after all discovered what must make the id happy. The id, not knowing the exact nature of the object so recommended by the ego, takes it (in its blindness) for its own desire and makes friends with the ego. There upon both of them go on happily with each other and advance a long way in the direction of their common ideal, till contact and intimacy with the ideal reveal to the ego and the id the qualities of Beauty that it is lacking. The id discovers that the object recommended to it by the ego was unsatisfactory to its nature and hence there is a split between the ego and the id which we call a conflict, a shock, a worry or a nervous disorder. A conflict, a shock or a worry is a condition of the id's non-cooperation with the ego in its striving after the object that it had recommended. The ego thereupon tries to recommend another object immediately, if it can, but frequently the new object is not adequate or else the id is not free to love it or appreciate its beauty because it has not been able to disengage itself (its love) from the object that had caused the disappointment and therefore the nervous disorder continues.

It is a sort of a revenge on the part of the id against the ego for misrepresenting Beauty and misusing a part of the energy of the id. A mental conflict ensues during which there is the absence of harmony between the ego and the id. Particular incidents which cause the disappointment of the id are, so to say, remembered by it in the form of repressions or complexes as grievances against the ego as if the id feels that it has been betrayed by the ego and left in the lurch. This makes the ego miserable as the personality is divided.

The id and the ego together constitute the whole consciousness or self of man. The super-ego is merely a function of the ego by means of which it holds up ideals and norms of behaviour. The super-ego would have been a needless discrimination except for the fact that a separate name draws attention to an important function of the ego. The ego performs this function by virtue of the push it receives from the id towards Beauty. The real force of which the ego and the super-ego are the products is the id. The ideals are the ego's interpretations of the object desired by the id. They are the ego's ideas of the highest beauty which it forms from time to time. The self is thoroughly good by nature and wants to push itself towards the Truly Beautiful with perfect internal harmony which is broken only on account of the errors of the ego. All the miseries of man and all the evil in the world are due to the sincerely committed mistakes of the ego in translating the desires of the id.

When a tension arises between the ego and the id it can be removed, before it produces its worst results in the form of nervous diseases, if the person has an immediate recourse to a sincere repentance, and prayers and devotions to the Divine Self. That will be only a case of the ego returning to Beauty the real desire of the id. This restores the id to peace and contentment and makes the ego independent of the former super-ego, that is, independent of its own previous misrepresentations of the id's desires. Sincere prayers are not possible without faith, or what is the same thing, without a

vision or knowledge of Beauty, which is a matter of development. Therefore regular habits of devotions and prayers are a safeguard against possible attacks of nervous diseases as well as a cure for them.

The id is too ready to make peace with the ego as soon as it finds that it is serving it aright, as if it is generous and quickly accepts the repenetance and the entreaties of the ego. Its grievances disappear as soon as the ego mends its ways and begins to seek Beauty. The ego and the id become friends as their quarrel is reconciled. The conflict disappears and the self (that is the ego plus id) is able to move forward towards Beauty, the common goal of its two parts. When it does so the id gets greater and greater expression till the whole of it becomes the ego. The unconscious mind rises into the conscious and thereby the satisfaction and the power of the conscious mind are enhanced immensely. It is this process which we have described elsewhere in this book as the liberation or the highest evolution of the self which leads to the greatest happiness known to man.

Freud admits the value of prayers and devotions in altering the relation between the various regions of mind and says that psychoanalysis attempts to achieve much the same. He writes :—

"It can be easily imagined too that certain practices of the mystics may succeed in upsetting the normal relations between the different regions of the mind, so that, for example, the perceptual system becomes able to grasp relations in the deeper layers of the ego and in the id which would otherwise be inaccessible to it. Whether such a procedure can put one in possession of *ultimate truths from which all good will flow* can be safely doubted. All the same we must admit that the therapeutic efforts of psychoanalysis have chosen much the same method of approach. For their object is to strengthen the ego, to make it more independent of the super-ego, to widen its field of vision and so to extend its organisation that it can take over new portions of the id.

Where id was there shall ego be".

We have said enough so far to be able to assert against the writer that the clue to the "*ultimate truths from which all good will flow*" does lie in the power which the practices of the mystics possess to alter the normal relations between the different sections of the mind and that the writer is not at all safe in doubting or under-rating the importance of his observation. If we follow up the clue it must certainly lead us to the conclusion that the real desire of the id is Beauty and not sexuality. This fact, when known, will make a huge difference in our knowledge of human nature and enable us to solve many intricate problems of human life which have so far baffled all solutions.

Not only do prayers and devotions prevent nervous diseases but they also possess a genuine therapeutic value for their treatment and psycho-analysis, although very valuable as a method of discovering the buried impulses and bringing them to light, does not constitute the whole treatment. The method of psycho-analysis has to be revised in the light of the truth that the unconscious urge is for Beauty. It has to be supplemented by prayers and devotions as a necessary part of the treatment based on the true and natural relationship between the ego and the id. The success of psycho-analysis all by itself in effecting a cure is doubtful unless it is employed by an expert psycho-therapist. But, even if it succeeds, its cure must be temporary because it does not fortify the patient against future attacks and does not remove the real cause of the trouble which is the choice of wrong ideals, unsatisfactory to the id. No physician can ignore the fact that prevention is always better than cure. In the case of nervous disorders prevention can be secured not by psycho-analysis but by regular habits of prayers.

Unless the ego chooses Beauty or Perfection for its ideal, it is sure to make the id miserable again. The ultimate deliverance of the id depends upon the right choice of the ego, whenever it is made. The "less ideal situation"

mentioned by Freud in a quotation given above in which "the rider is obliged to guide his horse in the direction in which it (the horse) itself wants to go" is not the result of what the horse (id) wants to do but of what the rider (ego) does, owing to an error. The rider and the horse always want to go in the same direction, the one leading to their common destination, but the rider commits frequent mistakes and misguides itself as well as the horse. Such mistakes, *when discovered* create shocks and nervous diseases. If the ego succeeds in making the right choice it gives satisfaction to the id and draws the id's *libido* on to itself. "The id becomes the ego and the ego is installed where id was". The individual becomes a highly dynamic personality possessing powers not known to other people. The prayers detach the ego from the influence of wrong ideals and thereby give it relief and also pacify the id. This also explains why certain mystics are able to give information of future events at particular occasions. As Freud says the "laws of space and time do not operate on the id" and therefore when ego becomes the id, it rises above space and time, so that for a moment the present and the future, and distant and the near become alike to it.

The fundamental cause of a nervous trouble is the choice or the love of a wrong ideal. The cure achieved through psycho-analysis is also ultimately due to the patient having changed his ideal. It is claimed that the mere recall of the repressed desire effects the cure. It is quite intelligible. The patient forgets the painful experience because he wants to forget it on account of its painfulness with the result that a portion of the energy of love in the unconscious is locked up in the thwarted and forgotten impulse. It is not available for a new ideal although the patient would very much like to love a new ideal in order to start life afresh and give up every thing that had caused the trouble. As soon as the forgotten experience is recalled, the patient knows what was the wrong with him. He is immediately in a position to compare his old ideal

with the new one which he now desires to love and to give up the old ideal as unsatisfactory and troublesome with the result that the locked up energy is at once liberated and made available for the new ideal. The wholeness of the mind is restored. The suggestion and consolation of the physician play an important part in the treatment because they help the patient to change his ideal and to start on a new road. What we need for the prevention of future nervous troubles is to have an ideal which we can love completely and continuously and which we never require to change. It is the change of ideal made possible by the revival of the buried impulse to which Freud refers when he says that psycho-analysis attempts to make the ego more independent of the super-ego and to widen its field of vision. Unfortunately he ignores the fact that absolute independence of the super-ego is impossible for the ego on account of the very nature of the unconscious mind. The super-ego merely presents another ideal instead of the one that had caused the trouble and that is the sense in which the ego's field of vision is widened or in which the ego becomes more independent of the super-ego. But be it remembered that the ego's field of vision can never be large enough to protect it from nervous diseases permanently unless it chooses the Right Ideal.

It is well known that in very many cases a patient is made worse by psycho-anlysis. The reason is that psycho-analysis can succeed only if the patient's ideal has changed between the first attack of illness and the end of its treatment. If during this period the patient cannot be made free from the impulses causing the trouble or, which is the same thing, if his ideal cannot be altered or raised higher, bringing the complex to light is certain to make him worse for reasons already explained. This fact supports the view that *the real cause of the cure does not lie so much in the discovery of the conflict as in the changing or the raising of the ideal.*

In cases where the patient is able to realise the folly of

his attitude and thus changes his ideal, as soon as the complex is brought to light the portion of the self's love which was attached to the old ideal is directly attached to the new one, with which the self has now learnt to identify itself. Thus the store of love in the unconscious is placed at the service of the ideal again and the self begins to function as a whole once more. We see the result of it in the form of an increased efficiency of the individual, because he is enabled to give the whole of his love to his ideal. The skill of the psycho-analyst consists in recalling the forgotten circumstances which led to the conflict. The cure is due to the developed self-knowledge of the patient and the consequent alteration or elevation of his ideal helped by the influence of the physician suggesting verbally or by his mere presence and the atmosphere around him, that he is no longer swayed by the impulse that had caused the injury. Neurosis is only an extreme form of our common worries or misfortunes. The ultimate cure of all such troubles consists in raising the ideal in the scale of beauty. Repentance and prayers and devotions to the Divine Self are the most effective methods of raising the ideal.

The id may be compared to a blind king whom the circumstances have thrown far away from his kingdom. He wants to return to his country but, unable to see his way back, he has hired a servant (the ego) to help him on the condition that should he succeed in guiding him back to his kingdom rightly, he will share the royal authority with him. From the spot where he is there are innumerable roads leading in different directions all appearing to be equally beautiful but there is only one road which leads right up to the king's country. Every other road is closed at some distance from the starting point or else leads into the territory of deadly enemies, or dangerous forests. The servant makes conjectures and leads the king into one road after another but every time both have to return disappointed and disillusioned. Every time that the servant chooses a new wrong road, he does so with all the care and wisdom

that he commands and makes perfectly sure that this time he is not mistaken. Therefore every time both the king and the servant walk happily on the selected road with full confidence that they are approaching nearer and nearer to their destination. The road appears to the servant to possess all the signs of the right road about which the king has supplied a vague sort of information to him. The servant interprets this information in the signs of the road and finds it to be perfectly applicable to them. The only sign that the wrong road happens to be lacking is continuity which they soon discover to their lot. In the absence of continuity all the other signs also prove to be mere illusions.

The right road is that of Beauty. The ego's knowledge of the signs is the super-ego. The troublesome journey backwards after the discovery of each error is the worry, nervousness or conflict. What psycho-analysis does is to help a quick journey backwards and if possible to put the ego and the id on a new road again but it has no means of making sure that the new road chosen by them now is the correct one. It cannot prevent future errors and therefore future attacks of nervous diseases.

THE VIEW OF ADLER

We may now consider the alternative view of Adler about the character of the unconscious urge.

According to Adler, "the key to human psychology is the desire to compensate for an unconscious feeling of inferiority. The individual comes into the world weak, insignificant and helpless; ridiculously ill-equipped in the struggle against nature, he is completely dependent upon his elders for warmth food and shelter. Moreover, they dominate him psychologically impressing him with a sense of their superior powers, their knowledge of the world and their freedom to live as they please. For every thing he must turn to them and the dependence thereby engendered imbues him from his earliest year with a sense of personal inferiority. To compensate for this inferiority the child

tries to impress himself on his environment. He endeavours to assert himself and become the centre of interest and win the praises of his fellows."

The question arises: Is this desire for self-assertion due to external causes or to the internal nature of the child? If the fact is that the child is accustomed to seeing only superior people around him from the very beginning why is it that he does not reconcile himself to an inferior position and take it as a matter of course and as the only thing that is natural?

Obviously, the child cannot want to assert himself and seek what he considers to be a greatness and a superiority unless it is a part of his nature to regard certain things as great, superior and worthy of effort and achievement as well as to strive for the achievement of those things. It is this part of human nature that we have described as the urge for Beauty.

And then what is the child's object in gaining this superiority and power. According to Adler his object is that he may win the admiration and praise of his fellow-men and become the centre of their interest which means that with him and with others the superiority or the power that he wants to achieve is something which is praiseworthy, admirable and worthy of being the object of attention and interest. As such the power that the child wants to attain is clearly another name for Beauty and the urge of self-assertion in the child is nothing but the urge for Beauty. Beauty, according to our definition, is that something which is the object of self's love, praise and admiration. Power is Beauty, because we love it. Conversely, Beauty is power because it calls forth love and thereby rules and dominates the lover. We have already seen that Beauty is not one quality but a system of qualities which includes power. Power is not a separate kind of Beauty. Beauty has no kinds; it is one and indivisible. Power is a quality of Beauty as well as the whole of Beauty; it includes all the qualities of Beauty. Every quality of Beauty is the whole of Beauty and includes all its other qualities. If any quality

of Beauty does not contain all its other qualities, it is not that quality at all. A man who has achieved only one quality of Beauty and not the others, cannot get a complete satisfaction in the long run. A powerful man will ultimately have a sense of inferiority however powerful he may be if he does not use his power for the achievement of Beauty, Goodness and Truth. Power for this reason is not the ability to be cruel. Power is an ultimate weakness if it is divorced from Truth and Goodness. Similarly Truth and Goodness have no meaning without Power. No quality of Beauty remains itself when it is excluded from the rest of its qualities. Reality is always pure. A mixture of the real and unreal is unreal. No part of Beauty can be identified with the whole of it. We cannot be ultimately satisfied by owning some qualities of Beauty and neglecting the others. The urge of our consciousness is for the whole of Beauty and we continue to feel inferior ultimately as long as the whole of it is not satisfied.

Beauty or Consciousness is Power and it is a power which asserts itself for the realization of its own purposes. On the divine side the whole course of evolution is a record of this self-assertion. On the human side also it is asserting itself for the realization of the purposes of the individual selves which we have called the ideals. On the human side the power will be real power if it is serving the Perfect Ideal. If the ideal is imperfect the power that serves it is also imperfect and unreal because it is unable to achieve perfection. It will only achieve imperfection, defect and ugliness to the extent to which the ideal is imperfect, defective or ugly. It will expend itself in vain, defeat its object, and thus bring about its own ruin. It will be a weakness and not Power. Power is power only to the extent to which it is able to achieve Beauty or Perfection. Power is worse than weakness if it cannot be utilized for the achievement of Beauty. In view of these facts it is perfectly correct to say that there can be no Power without Beauty and no Beauty without Power.

Since Power is meant for the achievement of the ideal and is measured by its capacity to achieve the ideal, to achieve Power is therefore to achieve the ideal. We frequently mistake power for the prospects or the possibilities of weilding power. But actual power is that which has been actually expended in the achievement of the ideal. It is power only to the extent to which it has actually achieved the ideal. Power therefore includes the ideal, it includes Beauty. Power and Beauty are two aspects of one and the same thing. They go hand in hand with each other; in fact they cannot be distinguished from each other. Power itself is the ideal; it is Beauty. Power has no meaning without Beauty and Beauty remains ineffective and meaningless without Power, because then we do not feel its attraction; it has no influence or effect on us. Beauty is Beauty only to the extent to which it is Power. If it does not exert its power on us, if it does not dominate us, rule us or if it does not urge us to action for its achievement it does not attract us and therefore it is not Beauty at all.

We want Power for the achievement of our ideal whatever the ideal may be. Power elates us and gives us a sense of superiority because it is a message that at last we have achieved our ideal and have become as intimate with Beauty as we desired. Because Beauty is unlimited we never imagine that we have enough of Power or enough of Beauty. We want Power for more Power and Beauty for more Beauty. Our desire for Beauty or Power is insatiable because when we have achieved one ideal another rises up before our eyes and thus we go on achieving more Power and more Beauty always.

Power is meant for the ideal and because our ideals are different our ideas of power are also different.

Our desire for power is really a desire for Beauty. We feel inferior and powerless only when we are unable to achieve our ideal. Just consider the various ways in which we assert ourselves for power and superiority and see

whether what we really want to achieve by our effort is power or beauty. We have a sense of power and superiority when we win the love or approval of a person possessing admirable qualities, because thereby we feel that we have become sharers in his beauty. To secure the approval and love of society is a very powerful ideal with most people. They want power or position to win this approval. Again we have a sense of superiority and power when we act morally because we introduce beauty into our actions. We feel superior when we indulge in a truly creative activity like Art and Science because thereby we express beauty or discover beauty.

In short all activities in which we seek beauty give us, if successful, a sense of power and superiority. We attain power by seeking beauty and we feel inferior whenever we fail in the search for beauty whatever the form it may take. Freud is right when he says that the sense of guilt and the sense of inferiority are exceedingly difficult to distinguish. We feel guilty when we are unable to display our power and we feel inferior when we are unable to reach the object that we consider beautiful. Thus Beauty and Power are one and the same.

In short, the reasoning of Adler leads us even more easily and clearly than that of Freud, to the conclusion that Beauty alone is the urge of life. The fact that this hypothesis is a common formula by means of which we can reconcile the two conflicting theories of psycho-analysis, is a further assurance of its correctness.

Chapter VIII

RESISTANCE AND ACTION

The most fundamental need of the self is not knowledge but action. It acquires knowledge for the sake of action. Conation and not cognition is the essential nature of self. Cognition arises in the service of conation. The self is like an arrow perpetually flying towards its target. It must act and act always. It wants to push forward and the ideal is simply the direction towards which it happens to be pushing itself at any time. The reaching-forward tendency of the self presses and persists under all circumstances, because there is always some direction in which the self is moving. Knowledge arises, develops and improves in the service of this tendency. It has no other purpose except to guide the self's urge for action; it is acquired in, for, and because of this urge.

The innumerable ideals chosen by the self from time to time are the channels which this urge wears out for itself. The best ideal, the Right Ideal, is that ideal which is able to organize this urge rightly and best of all, which permits it the fullest and the most continuous expression. The self's urge for the Right Ideal is really its urge for action as intense and as free and forceful as possible. An ideal is wrong when it does not give any scope for a continued action of this kind. The self is a force for action and this force is at its best and maximum when it is being utilized by the Right Ideal, like a car which runs at the greatest speed on a smooth, free and straight road. The self is like a sword and the Right Ideal is like a whet-stone which renders it sharp and penetrating.

The relation of the ideal to the self is not the relation

of a theory to the intellect. An ideal is not a theory but an urge for action. It is a pressure on the self to change the actual conditions in the world to suit itself and to suit its ideal which becomes a part of itself. The Right Ideal, like every other ideal, is not a statement or a proposition but it is a call for action, which in its case reaches the highest intensity and force. As long as an ideal is a theory or a proposition it is not an ideal at all. Action and ideal cannot be separated. Ultimately your ideal is what you act. The Right Ideal raises the acting power of the self to a maximum because it is able to monopolize the whole of the self's love and thereby to concentrate its power. Because it inspires the self with a single purpose, the whole of its energy flows into a single channel; no part of it is wasted. The whole of it is utilized by a single desire as there are no other desires to share it or to divide it among themselves. The Right Love becomes such a strong desire that every other desire is worsted when it comes into conflict with it. It gives the instinctive impulses and emotions their proper place, controls them so that they are not only rendered incapable of encroaching upon the self's love but are also pressed into its service. Under its influence the self is completely delivered from mental conflicts and complexes. Thus all factors which weaken the will power are eliminated. The Right Ideal alone gives an unlimited scope for the development of love and as love develops, more and more of the power of self becomes available to it till finally the whole of it is placed at its disposal. It conquers all other desires completely.

A wrong ideal may also enable us to achieve a concentration of purpose and a high degree of love when we erroneously and unconsciously attribute to it the qualities of the Right Ideal. But a wrong ideal can never succeed in attaching to itself the whole of the self's love, and that is why it is a wrong ideal. Its love can never reach that limit of intensity which can be achieved by the Right Ideal. The reason is that owing to its inability to conform to our inner

standards of beauty we remain unconsciously dissatisfied with it. Moreover, when this dissatisfaction becomes conscious and known, as it must in the long run, the illusion is over and we are forced to give up the ideal. Thus we can love a wrong ideal neither completely nor constantly. We change over to another ideal because the limit upto which we can love such an ideal is reached much sooner than we desire. It becomes apparent before long that we cannot love it to the fullest extent.

It is by action that life has evolved in the past and it is by action that it will evolve in the future. The evolution of self depends upon action so much that even where action is wrong and mis-directed, provided it embodies a rare effort, it enables the self to enhance its power. Persons who act honestly and wrongly rather than think morally and rightly are ultimately more efficient servants of truth. A wrong ideal that can intoxicate a person with the love of action is far more conducive to the ultimate evolution of the self than a Right Ideal which is in his mind no more than a theory incapable of inducing action and effort. The best lover of a wrong ideal must ultimately prove to be the best lover of the Right Ideal.

Action is creation; it is evolution. All creation and evolution is the creation and evolution of self. Evolution has no other meaning except this that the World-Self is creating the human self through its various stages and the human self is creating itself through them and thus collaborating with the World-Self sometimes consciously and sometimes unconsciously. We can look upon the Universe from two points of view—as activity of the World-Self and as activity of the human self. As activity of the World-Self it is always creative, that is, the sum-total of its result is always creation, improvement and evolution. As activity of the human self it is directly and consciously creative only when it is moral. Creation is action in the service of the ideal. It means to seek a beloved; it means self-display and self-assertion.

To act is to attack and overcome resistance. Resistance is essential for action and evolution. Life has been overcoming resistance from the very beginning and it will continue to overcome it till the end of the world. There would have been no evolution without resistance or obstacles in the way of life. Life is a process of struggle. Effort is life's method by which it developes and attains to higher and higher levels. By effort at each stage life acquires the powers that enable it to appear at the next higher stage. To offer resistance to life is to compel it to overcome resistance, to make it exert itself and thereby to add to its powers. Obstruction to the activities of life stimulates its energies. It leads to a clearer definition of the end of the activity and of the means to that end. It creates for the creature the necessity to exert itself and to concentrate its powers in a manner which would have been otherwise impossible. When a river is obstructed by a narrow passage in the mountains it flows with such a force that the hardest of rocks are worn away. The birds grew wings because they made an effort to fly. Our animal ancestors began to walk on two legs because they made an effort to do so. To have a purpose and to make effort for its achievement is a characteristic of life. Effort is the result of impediments in the way of life's purposes and the result of effort is firstly, the enlargement of the powers of life in order to overcome the impediments and secondly, the development of its capacity to have higher purposes and overcome new impediments. Resistance must be welcomed. It must be faced and crushed at all costs because that is the way in which we can advance. We cannot make a compromise with resistance. If we do so we recede on the road of progress and come back to death and annihilation.

The evolution of consciousness may be compared to the gradual development of a seed into a flower. The seed contains within it the flower but it takes time to unfold itself and reveal the flower. As long as it is a seed the flower is enclosed in it. When the seed grows into a branch the

flower is still buried and enfolded in the branch. When it pushes itself out of the branch it appears in the form of a bud. The bud is finally unfolded by the morning breeze one day and we have the beautiful flower in full bloom. Just as the seed must grow into a flower so the originally created material energy which has evolved so far into the present shape of the Universe must continue its evolution till fully-blooming self-consciousness makes its appearance.

Consciousness has already covered most of its journey and a time is soon coming when a human society of the highest self-consciousness will make its appearance. The earliest form of life developed into the shape of matter with its laws in the course of ages. It was a preparation for the future evolution of life. Thus when life advanced to the final stage of matter it travelled some distance towards its freedom. When life appeared in the form of the amoeba it became clear that while the final stage of matter was a stage of freedom for life as compared with its previous stages it was a necessity and a compulsion for it as compared with the stage of the amoeba that was to follow. When life reached the highest point of evolution in the animal stage below man it was a great advancement towards freedom as compared with the stage of the amoeba but it was yet a stage of slavery as compared with the human stage that came next. Thus life grew and evolved at every stage by breaking the resistance of its own present. Every stage in its development in the past was a stage of its freedom as well as of its slavery—freedom when we looked to its past and slavery when we looked to its future. Life was in a way encircled by innumerable rings of resistance which it had to break one by one in order to advance. Action or conscious activity is the method by which life breaks these rings. Action, therefore, takes the form of aggression and attack.

In the earlier stages of its development life evolved through the conscious activity of the World-Consciousness, or through the forward-pressing tendency of consciousness which became manifest at the animal stage as the *elan vital*

of Bergson. But as life became more and more conscious of itself it increased its freedom and developed its powers of action. It became more and more consciously a sharer in the activity of the World-Self. The activity of the living creature was its own from one point of view and it was that of the World-Consciousness from another point of view. By means of action the creature was able to draw on to itself more and more of the powers of consciousness for its own conscious employment of them. The creature's effort and action enabled consciousness to manifest more and more of itself, of its capacities and potentialities, in the creature. Consciousness became active in the animal through it and for the sake of the future evolution of the animal as well as its own. At the animal stage the animal's action enabled consciousness to express itself in the form of a further complication and multiplication of instincts. When this process reached its end we had the human form where a new kind of urge—the urge of self—became manifest. The future progress and evolution of man depends upon action no less than the evolution of the animal depended upon it. Just as the effort and action of the animal were nothing but the expression of the urge of instincts so human action is nothing but the expression of the urge of self.

Life came to have a conscious purpose first of all as soon as it reached the animal stage. It was a fixed, inflexible, imperative purpose over which the creature had no control. It was the urge for the preservation of life, the earliest form of which was the desire for food. As the creature indulged in its activity for the satisfaction of its urge for food, it met with resistance from matter. All its acitvity was no other than its effort to break this resistance. The effort resulted in the satisfaction of this urge but that was not the only result of it. Another and a more important result of it was that the creature was able to enlarge its powers, to increase its capacity for movement, and to extend its sphere of activity and its scope for the satisfaction

of its fundamental urge of hunger.

By overcoming resistance in the way of its desire for food the creature gradually drew upon itself more and more of the powers of consciousness which resulted in the multiplication of instincts and the appearance of higher and higher forms of life ending in man. Thus in the animal stage, nature's method of evolution was to compel the creature to act and make effort by putting the resistance of matter in the way of its urge for the preservation of life.

At the human stage of evolution, life has developed a higher kind of urge which is due to the fact that consciousness has obtained a certain measure of freedom in the human form of life. But the whole of our consciousness is not yet free; the major part of it is still covered up by the instincts or by our animal nature and is continually meeting resistance from it. We have to make further freedom for ourselves by struggling with the help of our enlarged powers to break through the resistance of the instincts. On the one hand our animal nature still demands a struggle with matter for the preservation of our life. On the other hand our higher nature demands a struggle with our instincts for keeping up our future evolution. We have to satisfy the urge of self as well as the urge of instincts simultaneously—the urge of self for its own sake and the urge of instincts for the preservation of our life—and we are always doing it sometimes cleverly and sometimes clumsily. When we satisfy these two different demands of our nature in such a way that the lower urge does not encroach upon the higher one, but on the other hand supports and helps it (thus performing the function for which it is really meant) we are clever and progressive. This happens when we choose the Right Ideal. When we give too much importance to the urge of instincts forgetting that it is but the servant of the urge of self, our progress is retarded.

In any case, whenever we satisfy an instinctive desire we never satisfy it in its natural form like an animal. Although we inherit all our instincts from the animals yet

the manner in which we satisfy any one of them is never determined entirely by the natural biological force of the instinct itself. It is always coloured, influenced or modified by the urge of self to make it suit its own purpose. The urge of self gives the demand of every instinct that definite form and that particular importance which the ideal requires. In fact, the ultimate way in which we satisfy our instinctive desires depends entirely upon the nature and the force of the ideal. Whenever an instinctive desire is also the ideal it gains in force tremendously. Since our action is motivated by two forces—the urge of instinct and the urge of self—it so happens that whenever we satisfy an instinctive impulse we act upon both matter and instinct at the same time—upon matter for the sake of the instinct and upon instinct for the sake of the ideal. We satisfy all our needs harmoniously and consistently with the deepest aspirations of the Universe as well as our own nature only when we act under the influence of the Right Ideal. When we do so we march towards freedom and continue our progress.

The fact that instincts offer resistance to the urge of self and have to be combated by it does not lessen the importance of instincts in any way. Rather, it proves their importance, because the self could not progress without opportunities of effort and action which the resistance of instincts is offering. The object of self's fight with instincts is not to suppress them and neglect them completely but only to keep them within proper limits so that they do not obstruct the urge of self but rather aid it and allow it to have a continued satisfaction. Neither must we nor can we discard the instincts. On the other hand we must see that they are pressed into the service of the Right Ideal because their proper satisfaction is demanded by the urge of self. If the full-grown self is a blooming flower, our animal nature is the branch that bears it. There can be no flower unless the branch is kept fresh and green and the whole plant is watered and manured and generally looked after. But the branch, although it must be kept fresh and

green is not our end. At the point where the bud has just peeped out, the branch should loosen its stiffness sufficiently to permit the whole of the bud to come out and then bloom in full beauty. The branch is the instinct and the bud is the growing self. To satisfy the demands of the instincts in ourselves as well as in others is to help evolution and, therefore, to perform a highly moral and creative deed. This fact explains the value of charity in religion. But unproportionate charity is as bad as miserliness because it is as bad to starve the instinctive desires in myself as it is to starve them in others.

Self-consciousness, once enclosed in our animal nature breaks the resistance of the latter and comes out of it while still retaining contact with it exactly as the flower breaks the resistance of the branch, comes out of it and hangs by it. Just as the freshness of the branch is essential for the growth of the rose, the health of the body, which means the proper satisfaction of the instincts, is essential for the growth of the self. Instincts are a means to an end and have to be satisfied as a means and not as an end in the interest of our freedom and evolution.

There can be no evolution without the continuation of life. Our instincts preserve the life of the individual and the race and thus continue the process of evolution. Thus they serve the interests of the self in more than one way. As they compel activity for the maintenance of life they take away much of the burden of self which otherwise may have neglected a part of this duty. The compulsion of insincts is an advantage from this point of view but it is a disadvantage because it weighs on the liberty of the self. It is again an advantage because it offers resistance, induces effort and makes evolution possible.

The urge of self always looks to its own needs. Its principal object is to strive for the ideal, but it also looks to the urge of the instincts as a means to this end. It makes sure that the demand of the instincts is receiving due attention—neither more or less. Whenever it receives more

attention or less attention, it thwarts the urge of self. When it is receiving more attention than necessary it is encroaching upon the self's love for the ideal and, therefore, retarding the evolution of self. When it is receiving less attention than it should, it is a grave situation and requires and actually calls forth the whole effort of the self to set it right because anything that threatens the preservation of life is also a threat to the urge of the ideal unless the ideal itself demands a sacrifice of life. In such a case, therefore, the self appears to leave the ideal and to attend solely to the needs of the body, but as a matter of fact, it does not leave the ideal even for a single moment. It attends to the body as a means to its own end *i.e.*, as a step in the achievement of its ideal.

Instinct is a form of automatism and hence bears a resemblance to matter. It is a fixed and, in a way, materialized consciousness. It may be regarded as a form of matter in comparison with consciousness. Matter helped the animal in two ways :

(1) By offering resistance and inducing effort it enlarged the powers of the animal.
(2) By behaving automatically it met half-way the effort of the animal to satisfy its hunger and other needs.

Similarly instincts help consciousness at the human stage in two ways :—

(1) By offering resistance and compelling effort they evolve the self.
(2) By functioning automatically they meet the consciousness half-way in its efforts to continue its own evolution by preserving the life of the individual and the race.

Life thus employed the resistance of matter as a means to further its own ends at the animal level. It employs instincts as a means to further its own ends at the human level. Matter at once resisted life and helped it to maintain and evolve itself at the animal stage. Similarly the

instincts at once resist life and help it to maintain and evolve itself at the human stage. Matter subserves the urge of instincts and the instincts subserve the urge of self.

The real progress of consciousness begins just above the stage of the instincts that is as soon as it obtains its freedom in man and extends far beyond that point.

When our ideal is the satisfaction of our instinctive desires, we are living not on the animal plane of life but much below it. We are opposing only matter. The force of the ideal and the force of the instincts are acting in the same direction and their resultant is equal to their sum-total. In this case our life is worse than that of the animals because while the animal, on account of the absence of any other urge besides the urge of instincts, satisfies its urge up to its natural limits prescribed by the natural strength of the instincts, we, by adding the urge of self to the urge of the instincts, give the latter an unnatural and exaggerated importance and force. The result is not only a dissatisfaction and a mental pain in the long run, for starving the desires of the self, but also physical injury and disease. We satisfy an instinct as an ideal or as a means to the achievement of an ideal. But the ultimate motivating force of our life is always the urge for an ideal. Although the urge of the instincts is compelling in its nature and we appear to be satisfying it for its own sake, yet really, our ideal is always fixing the limit and specifying the manner of its satisfaction. Thus its satisfaction becomes a means to an end. The ideal and not the instinct is the urge of our life.

Man will evolve by action and effort in future as the animal evolved by action and effort in the past. Resistance is a blessing for us as it quickens our progress. We must meet it and destroy it. When a man acts for the Right Ideal he is consciously and directly evolving himself. The real gain to him is not that he is reaching nearer the ideal but that he is reaching nearer to himself. Ultimately, the goal of man is man himself because when a man acts for his ideal he evolves his own self.

Action is really the action of the self and not that of the body. The physical body of the human being is only an instrument of action at the disposal of the self and benefits the self. It changes the self even when it is directly intended to change the outside world. The reality of the real outside world with which the self is dealing in its action is within the self. Therefore when the self is acting and changing the real, actual world outside itself it is changing itself. By action, the self approaches the ideal which is within itself, it comes nearer to itself, to its own meaning. It improves, evolves, or unfolds itself by means of action. But the actions of the self must naturally go waste and fail to evolve it to the extent to which its ideal is unreal, wrong or illusory. The destination of man is the unfolding of his own nature. This destination he can reach if he acts in accordance with his nature which consists of a powerful urge for the Right Ideal. When he acts in accordance with his nature consciously he is sharing the conscious activity of the World-Self in the Universe. His activity is in a way the activity of the Divine Self. It has the whole power of the Divine-Self behind it. It is in the direction of his activity that the World-Self is already acting. It is such a person who conquers determinism and becomes a co-worker of the Creator.

New-creating the universe from moment to moment as activity of the Divine-Self is free activity. All events and happenings in the world reflect this creative activity. We feel as if these events put limitations on our own freedom, but by becoming sharers in the free creative activity of the Divine Self we can outgrow and rule these limitations. We can control and change the events and happenings in the world so as to bring them nearer to their end as well as our own. As consciousness evolves through its three stages of matter, animal and man and approches the source of consciousness more and more it gets more and more of freedom till at the highest stage of its evolution it achieves its highest freedom. The stones are less free than the animals

and the animals are less free than the human beings and among human beings too it is the saints and the prophets who are the most free people. A highly self-conscious man is very near the source of consciousness and therefore suffers very little from the limitations of determinism. He becomes a sharer in the purposes of the Creator. The free activity of the Creator manifests itself in him. He does for the Creator what the Creator would have done for Himself. His actions are as much of the Creator and for the Creator as they are his own and for himself. His actions, since they carry out the purpose of the Creator, have all His support and power behind them. By favouring the potentialities of consciousness they establish a contact with and utilize the powers of consciousness which consciousness is too ready to expend for the purpose of actualizing its own potentialities. A man who has reached the highest stage of self-consciousness, therefore, decrees on behalf of the Creator and the Creator decrees on his behalf. He and the Creator both rule the Universe together since the purpose of neither is in conflict with that of the other.

Every obstacle in the way of love is meant to be conquered—such is the demand of love. Love cannot grow without hatred. The path of love can never be clear unless we conquer the obstacles in its way. Obstacles offer resistance, call forth action and lead to a greater realization of love and the evolution of the self. They are essential for the growth of love. A man who is aggressive against his obstacles is fighting the forces of the Devil. The Devil understood in this sense is essential for evolution. He serves a spiritual purpose.

What is known as a non spiritual, wrong, or sinful life is simply that part of it which is involved in a struggle and undergoing the hardships of evolution. Its stagnation is temporary and it must move forward ultimately as soon as it has the opportunity to do so. Sometimes the opportunity comes only in the next life; the struggle, that is, continues beyond death. We denote this condition as Hell.

Hell therefore exists in this world as well as in the next. Of course, in the same way Paradise must exist in this world as well as in the next. That individual self which is unable to conquer its obstacles now will have to conquer them in future. The desire of its nature is permanent and it must struggle to achieve it in the next life if it cannot achieve it here. Hell is nothing but a continuation beyond death of those battles of the self with its obstacles, which it was unable to win in this life.

The self can delay the struggle at its own cost, which may be very huge because just as every display of strength strengthens the self, every display of weakness weakens it with the result that the struggle becomes harder and more difficult with every slip. A sinner finds it increasingly difficult for him to return to good life till ultimately, he is separated from it by a huge barrier which it is extremely difficult for him to conquer. The struggle can be thus delayed and made extremely difficult but it cannot be avoided. The self cannot escape it. It must ultimately steer clear of all its obstacles. That is the path ordained for it by its own nature. It is not an imposition from outside nor is it due to the tyranny of a creator. But every self must ultimately rise to the stage of Paradise because it is life that dominates ultimately and not the Devil. The obstacles may have the better of life temporarily and partially but never permanently and completely. Life never loses the final battle of its struggle.

The continued evolution of life is the very object of creation. We can be always sure of its having a victorious career throughout. If it had been possible for life to be worsted by its obstacles man would have never appeared on this earth, so great were the dangers which life had to face in the past. When no opposition was strong enough to overcome it completely in the past, certainly no opposition will be strong enough to overcome it in the future. We can be confident therefore of a glorious future for man on this earth. As life has the better of its obstacles in this

world it must have the better of them also in the next world.

Hell is the state of the self's separation from Consciousness and Heaven is the state of its union with it. Both Hell and Heaven, therefore, must have their grades in such a way that the higher grades of Hell gradually merge into the lower grades of Heaven. There must be also a middle stage belonging neither to Hell nor to Heaven and corresponding to the state when the self feels that it is neither in Union with the Beloved nor far away from Him. The stages of Hell and the stages of Heaven are thus like the rungs of a single ladder which every self has to mount starting from a point which is high or low in accordance with the approach it had made towards the Beloved till the end of its earthly life. Every state of Hell or Heaven must be transitory yielding place to a higher state as soon as the self has qualified for it, because every self is compelled by its nature to continue to approach its destination which is the Consciousness of the Universe. But the greater the distance of a self from its destination the more difficult it will be for it to approach it or to qualify for a higher state. Thus there will be some selves (those that have *deliberately* chosen to love wrong ideals and do wrong deeds and thereby spoiled the urge of their nature) for whom it will be extremely difficult to make any progress in the next life.

On the definition of Hell and Heaven given above, both the Hell and the Heaven must exist here as well as in the hereafter. There are two Hells, one in this world and the other in the next as there are two Heavens, one in this world and the other in the next. In fact the Hell and the Heaven of the next world are but the continuation of the Hell and the Heaven of this world. The Hell of this world is not painful but rather agreeable because in this world the self is rarely conscious of its separation from its Beloved, the Consciousness of the Universe. In the actual state of its separation from the Beloved, it is generally able to console itself by

means of the Beloved's substitutes, the wrong ideals, each of which it takes for the Beloved Himself. It imagines, for the time its wrong love is having a smooth course, that it is enjoying the Beloved's union to the fullest extent. Its Hell in this world has, therefore, the appearance of a Heaven. But whenever the substitutes of consciousness play false, as they must, sooner or later, the self experiences a Hell on this earth in the form of grief, fear, anxiety and sorrow which however acute and unbearable they may be, are yet never at their worst because they have always a silver lining of hope, conscious or unconscious. A new ideal is always at hand to take the place of the lost friend and to deliver the self from its worry.

The real Hell is experienced by the self when it has the misfortune to carry the state of its separation from consciousness over to the next life. Then the grief, fear, sorrow and anxiety of the self are at their worst, because all wrong ideals, all substitutes of the Beloved, all imaginary and deceptive sources of consolation have disappeared. For the first time in its life the self becomes conscious of its utter loss, that is, of its complete and incurable separation from the Beloved. It must, therefore, experience a torture that knows no bounds. Our deepest misfortunes, miseries and tortures in this life cannot be in the least comparable to this experience. The experience most akin to this sense of utter separation from Consciousness is that of being consumed in a fire. It is not in vain that the lovers of all times and places have compared the anguish of the beloved's separation to the pain of burning in a fire. The self will, therefore, *actually* feel that it is burning in the hottest of fires from which all avenues of escape are closed. Its mental state in that world will take the form of an objective reality as an objective reality takes the form of a mental state in this world.

Just as Hell is immensely more painful and torturous in the next life than it is here so Heaven is immensely more pleasant and agreeable in the next life than it is here. A

self that has attained to a high stage of self-consciousness and has established the contact of a whole-hearted love with Consciousness enjoys the bliss of Paradise on earth, but its bliss is rarely of the highest degree. Frequently the path of Love is beset with obstacles and difficulties. There are so many objects and ideas ready to encroach upon the self's love, to distract its attention and to share its regards. Matter, that is to say, the compulsion of our animal instincts, is always weighing heavily upon the self's liberty and pulling it down. The result is that the devoted self is always anxious and always struggling to keep its love one-sided, unmixed, clean and sincere. It's Heaven in this world has, therefore, the appearane of a prison. But when the loving self passes on to the next life, all obstacles in the path of love disappear at once. The moment the dying lover has a glimpse of the other world, he is animated by a sudden joy on account of which his countenance often breaks into a smile. The immediate assurance of a great and unexpected peace and happiness that lay in store for him, is reflected in his face and it can be taken as a sure sign of a true lover that when he dies his face is calm, tranquil or smiling. Thenceforward, since the self's love has a smooth sailing, the self experiences a joy that goes on increasing automatically and without any struggle or anxiety. This joy is Paradise. To have this joy is to have every thing; it is to have all possible desires and wishes satisfied at once. We know that the human self has only one desire—to win the pleasure or the approval of its Beloved the Consciousness of the Universe and all its other desires are included in it; they are its servants. When, therefore, the self is assured of the pleasure of the Beloved itself, it secures all that it wants; it can want nothing more. All that it can still desire is an ever greater and greater amount of the Beloved's pleasure and approval which it will, no doubt, continue to have. Every new glimpse of the Beloved's unlimited beauty will enrich the self and will qualify it for a still fresh glimpse of Him. Every approach that it will

make towards the Beloved will enable it to make a further approach towards Him.

The question whether a complete, ultimate union of the self with the Creator is compatible with its permanent individual existence presents no difficulty. The devoted self will enjoy a complete union with the Creator and yet maintain its independent existence for ever. My idea is a part of myself and yet has an independent existence of its own. We shall live for ever as realized ideas in the mind of the Creator becoming the source of a permanent joy for Him as a realized idea lives for ever in the mind of an artist being the source of a permanent pleasure for him.

The transcendant joy of Paradise results from the self's consciousness of the success of its love (ingrained in its very nature) for a personality of the highest beauty and perfection, that is, for Consciousness. It cannot be described nor imagined in this life for reasons already explained. The only joy of this life that comes nearest to and is most akin to the joy of Paradise, is the joy, before it gets mixed up with the lower, inferior kind of pleasure derived from sex indulgence, which a young man or a young woman feels in the affectionate association of a young beautiful person of the opposite sex. This is, of course, on account of the fact that the sex urge is carved out of the attraction of consciousness for Beauty and sex love begins by a love which is of a spiritual character. (See Chapter VII, pp. 50 to 53). We can, therefore, assume quite reasonably that the self will actually see in its state of Paradise that it is enjoying the loving company of young, beautiful persons of the opposite sex, although their company will be incomparably sweeter and more enjoyable than that of any earthly sweethearts. The reason is that the self must represent its conscious states in the next life by means of objects which are the fittest and the most suitable for representing them. Philosophers like Berkeley, Hegel, Croce and Gentile and scientists like Eddington have justly maintained that our conscious experience is the only reality of which we are assured. As in this

life, so in the next, nothing is real, nothing exists except our own conscious experience. Just as the outside world in this life is a representation of our own mental experience, so the outside world in the next life will be also a representation of our own mental experience. In other words, we shall actually create the objects of the outside world in the next life to suit our mental states. We have an imperfect and yet very suggestive analogy of it in our creation of the world of dreams. The fire of Hell and the sweethearts of Paradise in the next world will represent, what we shall experience mentally and they will be in no way less tangible, less visible or real than this world of matter, because this world too has no existence apart from our mind. The outside objects of the next world will be real in every sense of the word "real". The next world whether it takes the shape of Hell or Heaven will not be, therefore, a mere mental state. It will be a mental state that will take the form of a *place* which will be as real as any place that we can know of in this physical world.

Since the conscious experiences or the mental states of different selves will vary in the next life, the nature and quality of the outside objects will also vary. Each self will live in a world of its own mental creation; each self will enter a different Hell and a different Heaven which it was making for itself in this life. The temperature of fire in which each self will be burning in Hell as well as the Beauty and the love of sweethearts in the company of each self in Heaven will be different and will continue to change depending upon the stage of the self's evolution and the nature of its mental experience. We shall create not only the fire of Hell and the sweethearts of Paradise but all sorts of agreeable or disagreeable objects and their groups which will be capable of symbolising our mental states exactly. Because Hell and Heaven will be the representations or the projections of the mental states of the self, therefore, naturally, the tortures of Hell will become less and less and the pleasures of Heaven will increase more and more as the self will

make its advancement.

Throughout our lives we are either advancing towards Consciousness or receding from It. When we are moving forwards we are acting rightly and gaining in life, freedom and beauty. When we are receding from It we are acting wrongly and, therefore, losing in life freedom and beauty. The progress or regress of the self is the result of its actions which consist of the self's response towards outside events made, of course, always with a full sense of responsibility. Every action is either a Hell or a Heaven; every action is a state of the self's separation from or union with the Consciousness of the World.

Our conscious states of the next life which make our Hells and Heavens are only the real, correct versions of the conscious states of this life. A mental state of self in this world may be compared to the "negative" of a photographic plate in which the shades of the real picture are reversed. When a mental state goes over to the next life it resembles the final photograph in which the various parts of the picture re-appear in their proper shades. We are, as if, in a dream and awake to reality only in the next life. No experience of our life is real and permanent, as it is, except the joy which the self feels in devotion and service to its Beloved, the World-Self. This joy is celestial; it is Heaven on earth, and whoever has the good-fortune to experience it and to maintain it till the end of his life on earth is sure to enter Paradise unscathed and untouched by the fire of Hell.

In short our mental states of the next life are woven out of our actions in this life. An indelible, indestructible record of all actions is kept by each self and carried by it along with itself to the next life. This record remains buried in the depths of our unconscious mind which, one must conclude from the observations of Freud, does not forget even the smallest or the most in-significant events of our life.

Freud writes :

"Contradictory impulses exist side by side (in the id) without neutralizing each other or drawing apart. There is nothing in the id which can be compared to negation and we are astonished to find in it an exception to the philosophers' assertion that space and time are necessary parts of our mental acts. In the id there is nothing corresponding to the idea of time, no recognition of the passage of time and (a thing which is very remarkable and awaits adequate attention in philosophic thought) no alteration of mental processes by the passage of time. Conative impulses which have never got beyond the id and even impressions which have been pushed down into the id by repression are virtually immortal and are preserved for whole decades as though they had only recently occurred. They can only be recognised as belonging to the past, deprived of their significance and robbed of their charge of energy after they have been made conscious by the work of analysis and no small part of the therapeutic effect of analytic treatment rests upon this fact."

"It is constantly being borne in upon me that we have made far too little use of our theory of the indubitable fact that the repressed remains unaltered by the passage of time. This seems to offer us the possibility of an approach to some really profound truths. But I myself have made no further progress here."

The fact that the mental acts of the self are possible in the absence of space and time and there is "no alteration of mental processes by the passage of time" points only to the immorality of the self in as much as it becomes apparent that the self has the capacity to keep intact and to continue its mental states experienced in this life—the states that constitute a record of its actions—even when it has passed out of this world of space and time.

That all our mental states, all our actions leave a mark on the self and remain preserved in the unconscious is verified by the fact that some of the most insignificant, long forgotten events of our life, even those about which we

did not bother in the least in our waking life are recalled by us automatically in our dreams and form the woof and warp of dream symbolism. The hypnotist can revive the memory of any event in the life of his subject in a state of hypnotic trance by suitable questions.

The whole of the past of self preserved in the unconscious is unfolded before it in the next life as a series of mental states which the self has to re-live and re-experience one by one and bit by bit, not this time, in their disguised pleasantness or unpleasantness and with imaginary consolations or unavoidable anxieties which used to attend them in the material world, but in their real disagreeableness or agreeableness, and deprived of all the pleasant coverings produced by the errors of the self or free from all the unpleasant accompaniments due to its struggles and anxieties. The self must re-experience its mental states of the earthly life not as a reward or a punishment for its actions, decreed by a court of justice external to the self, but because the self has to move forward towards its unavoidable destination, it has to evolve. It is bound by the urge of its nature to advance but it cannot advance unless it has shed all the disabilities which cling to it, on account of the slips which it had the misfortune to make during its earthly life. It must re-acquire the positions from which it slipped in order to advance from them further. Its right actions in the earthly life which enabled it each time to make some progress towards Consciousness facilitate its efforts to regain those positions; they come to its help in its attempt to compensate for its errors. Thus the point from where the self begins, in effect, its career of Heaven or Hell is determined finally by *reckoning* the difference of the total of its approach towards and the total of its recession from consciousness in this life. In this way some individuals begin their career of the next life in Heaven and the others begin it in Hell; some are fortunate and others are unfortunate and this makes a huge difference.

In this account of the next world as built up by human

actions, we have not so far taken into account the important fact that the actions of self in so far as they are intended to change this world and to change the self do not end with the death of the physical body. A human self is not an isolated entity. It is a whole in itself but it is at the same time an indispensable part of a bigger whole which is the whole of the human society of the past and future. As a pebble thrown in a quiet lake creates waves that travel to its farthest limits long after the pebble has itself settled down at the bottom so the conscious life of every self in this world leaves behind it influences and repercussions which continue to change the world for better or for worse or for both, as long as the world lasts. These changes are due to the actions of the self which actions, therefore, cannot be said to have come to an end. The self lives in the material world on account of these actions partly and therefore they must continue to build for it a Hell or a Heaven in the next world. But the final and the total value of these actions as forces that aid or retard the evolution of humanity can be assessed only when they have come to an end, in other words, when the material world has ceased to exist. Thus when the world will come to an end there will be *a second reckoning* of the actions of every self which will finally determine its position in Hell or Heaven.

The Universe is similar to an organism or an individual. As there is a reckoning of the human individual at the death of his physical body, which is based on the whole of his life, so there will be a reckoning of the Universe at the end of its physical existence, which will take into consideration the whole life of the Universe, that is all human beings who have lived in this world in the past and who will live in it in future till the end of the world.

Consciousness is interested fundamentally in the evolution of humanity as a whole. It is concerned with the evolution of the individual selves because they are the parts of the whole which is humanity, because they aid each other's evolution and because their own individual

evolution is a means to the evolution of this whole.

The evolution of the social organism of humanity is analogous to the growth of an individual organism. The human race is growing from generation to generation as an organism or an individual grows from year to year. The individuals of each generation of humanity are like innumerable cells of a growing organism that come into existence, live, act, grow and procreate and thereby feed, sustain and grow the organism. They are being constantly worn out and substituted by healthier and stronger cells which perform the same function in their turn and thereby continue the growth of the organism. Slowly, as one generation of cells dies away another healthier and stronger generation arises to take its place. Similarly, the evolving social organism of humanity brings into existence innumerable human individuals who appear live, act, grow and procreate and thereby feed, sustain and grow, this huge organism. In due course of time, every generation wears itself away leaving a better generation to take its place and in this way the organism of the Universe continues its evolution.

The human individual has a birth, an infancy, a childhood, a youth, a middle age, an old age, a death and an after-life. The physical body of the individual grows, decays and dies but his self-consciousness evolves continuously and the process of its evolution continues beyond the death of the physical body. At death, there is an automatic reckoning of the net progress of the individual which is followed by a continuous evolution of the self on account of which its Hell rises gradually into a Paradise and the Paradise continues to improve in perfection. So the organism of the Universe too has a birth, an infancy, a childhood, a youth, a middle age, an old age, a death, and an after-life. The physical body of the Universe will grow, decay and die but the self-consciousness of the Universe, that is, of the humanity as a whole, will evolve continuously and the process of its evolution will go on

beyond the death of the Universe.

At the death of the Universe, since the actions of every self will come to a final end there will be a reckoning of the net progress of humanity on account of which the total and ultimate share of every self in the evolution of the world as a whole will be reflected in an immediate deterioration or improvement of its position in Hell or Heaven. This final reckoning will be followed again by a course of evolution in which the Hell of humanity will rise gradually into a Paradise and the Paradise will achieve a higher and higher perfection till the Creator will realize His idea completely and turn his attention to the creation of the next Universe. We live and evolve as thoughts in the mind of the Creator in this life and we shall live and evolve as thoughts in His mind in the next life as well. When we have reached our highest evolution we shall live as realized ideas in the mind of the Creator for ever. The achievement will be a source of permanent joy for us as well as for the Creator; He will be pleased with us and we shall be pleased with Him and this will be an everlasting Paradise.

It will not be out of place here, to mention that a modern development of Physics known as Carnot's principle or the Second Law of Thermodynamics supports the idea of the death of the Universe by showing conclusively that the Universe must have a beginning as well as an end, that it came into existence at a definite time in the past and must come to an end at a definite time in the future.

Our dreams enable us to understand the nature of our life hereafter to some extent. We can for example understand that we, our unconscious minds or our selves have properties which make it possible for us to live, act, think and feel and to experience pain and pleasure and all sorts of emotions without a physical body and that we may transcend the boundaries of space and time.

Freud has imagined that dreams are efforts of the unconscious mind to fulfil in sleep those of its sexual wishes

which it is unable to satisfy in waking life. He has tried to interpret a large number of the dreams of his patients from that point of view. But his interpretations are simply fantastic. It can be proved to the hilt by collecting facts and figures of dreams and the actual events of waking life following them in the case of thousands of persons that *our dreams are the self's interpretations of its own future experiences* i.e. *its mental and emotional attitudes towards actual future events of its life.* For such interpretations the self makes use of symbols derived from its past experiences *i.e.* objects, ideas and persons embodying the self's emotional reactions and attitudes towards events of the past. The self may dream the same event several times using different symbols each time. The choice of a particular set of symbols is influenced by the nature of the physical, biological or psychological stimuli immediately preceding the dream.

All dreams are images of future events but these images are sometimes blurred and sometimes vivid, depending upon our stimuli for the dream, with the result that some dreams are meaninglessly frightful and some others meaninglessly sweet, just as a person using various spectacles with uneven glasses of various colours and curvatures may make the same scene look more dreadful or more interesting than it really is.

The prevision of dreams can be explained by the fact that our unconscious mind is above time and for it future is as good as present and when the unconscious is at rest (and not divided into the conscious and the sub-conscious minds, not peeping into the outside world and not impelling the activity of our waking life through the conscious mind) as is the case when we are asleep, it is able to live the future events of its life which it interprets by means of appropriate symbols. As the self views such events in sleep in their real colour and from the point of view of their real importance to the self's task of realizing the ideal of its nature, it so happens, sometimes, that the symbols employed by the

self, are just the reverse of those which we would use for the event, as it actually takes place and looks to us in our waking life.

Chapter IX

POLITICS, HISTORY AND WAR

Aristotle rightly believed that man is a social animal. The self owes, the very knowledge of its existence to society. The self's ideal is a product of its social relations; the ideal grows in perfection as the social contacts of the self widen. The self is attracted not only towards the ideal but also towards men having the same ideal. The self lives in the ideal, for the ideal and because of the ideal which is derived from society and achieved in society. For these reasons the self is social fundamentally and naturally.

The love of the ideal and the love of men having the same ideal creates for man the need to live in the form of organized societies or states. Men having the same ideal are attracted towards each other and form a group which may be called an *ideal-group*. Moreover, since every ideal wants to develop its power indefinitely the self finds it an advantage to live in a group. Every self that becomes a member of an ideal-group is a force which can help other selves in the group to achieve their common ideal and to develop its power more and more by crushing every resistance in its way.

To live in society thus comes to us by way of nature and not as an external imposition or an artificial contract as Hobbes or Roussean would have us believe. Social life is not peculiar to man who alone can make artificial contracts; it is a characteristic of all species and the cause of it lies in the very nature of consciousness.

Since consciousness is one, since it is a whole, it has an urge to maintain its oneness or wholeness even when it has

expressed itself in the form of a number of individual of the same species. Owing to this tendency of life the members of every species that comes into existence in the course of evolution exhibit an affinity for each other, which the psychologists have called by the various names of the group-instinct, the herd-instinct or the gregarious instinct. Whenever they come together—and they always try to come together—they form a group and display an inclination to behave socially and as parts of a single whole which is the group. Whenever this tendency is fully developed, or is able to operate perfectly and freely, that is, without the obstruction of other instinctive tendencies, the group behaves as a single organism of which the cells may be regarded the individuals that constitute the group. Although this tendency exists in all species it has reached its perfect expression so far in bees and ants—the most highly-evolved species in this respect—and must reach its perfect expression in future in man at the highest stage of his evolution where all the qualities of consciousness will be displayed in their fullest harmony and splendour.

All life emanates from the same source, consciousness, but the feeling of oneness prevails particularly among the members of the species towards each other. This is so not merely because the animals are similar or because they hope to defend themselves better by living in the form of a group, but also, and more fundamentally, because every species is a distinct step in the evolution of life which cancels and takes the place of all the previous steps. Life is a whole, feels as a whole, and has the urge to maintain its wholeness, only at each fresh level at which it is able to emerge. It is for this reason that it will feel as a whole and maintain its wholeness also at that highest stage of its evolution in the human being which is its final objective. Life at higher stages of evolution has to rule and cannot feel one with life at lower and inferior stages which it has itself outgrown. It has at every step of its growth new aspirations and new powers to realize those aspirations which

the lower forms of life cannot share.

The feeling of oneness among the individuals of the same species can be regarded, therefore, neither merely as nature's provision for self-defence in the animal nor as an outcome of the similarity of the animals forms and desires. It is fundamental, it is due to an essential characteristic of life to function as a whole, to co-operate with all its other parts, in order to produce an organized group life at each step of its evolution. At the highest stage of evolution, when life has reached the nearest to its source, this characteristic, we can expect, will manifest itself in the form of a group of highly self-conscious human beings co-operating with each other and with the Consciousness of the Universe itself to produce an organized group life. The same characteristic we find manifested in an organism which is a collective being like a hive or formicary. An organism is a group, a colony or a confederation of social individuals which are the cells in its case, cooperating with each other to produce its co-ordinated functioning. The group, too, is meant to function as an organism. A group is an organism, an individual of which the cells are the members of the group, disseminated and dissociated more visibly and to a greater extent than in an organism, and yet bound together by a similar affinity.

We see that just as in the case of the cells the similarity of their functions is broken to the extent to which it is essential for the co-ordinated life of the organism, similarly in the case of individuals who are the members of an organized group, the similarity of their forms and desires is broken to the extent to which it is essential for the co-ordinated functioning of the group. This is observed, for example, in a bee-hive where the queen, the workers and the drones have different shapes and different functions. All the bees idolise the queen but perform their own separate duties as nurses, housemaids, masons, chemists, sweepers, wax-makers, guards, honey-collectors, princesses professional males, etc. for the organized life of thegroup. But

even the flights of birds and herds of wild animals like deers, antelopes, zebras and elephants choose the biggest or the most imposing bird or animal among them to serve as their leader owing to their nature to live an organised group-life.

Just as the life of an organism centre itself around the brain or the nervous system, so the life of a group centres itself around a leader and just as the health and the efficiency of the individual cells is the result as well as the cause of the health and the efficiency of an organism as a whole, so the health and the efficiency of the individuals in a group is the result as well as the cause of the health and the efficiency of the group as a whole.

A group cannot function like an organism without the leader, as an organism cannot function without the brain. A leader is natural and essential to every organized group whether the group is of human beings or of animals and whatever the state of the evolution of consciousness to which it belongs. The leader in every group is the representative or the substitute of Consciousness towards which all life is struggling, consciously or unconsciously and with the best of its powers of knowledge that it has come to possess at each step of its evolution; for Consciousness is at once the source and the destination of all life. In the animal stage the leader is a personification of the animals, urge *to live.* In the human stage the leader is a personification of man's urge *to love*, he is a personification that is, of his ideal. Each group is an inferior, imperfect copy—the extent of its inferiority and imperfection depending upon the stage of its evolution—of the Final Group which is the aim of evolution. We can expect that the leader of the group that will reach the highest stage of evolution in future (and, of course, this group will consist of human beings, highly self-conscious human beings) will be a man of the highest self-consciousness. He will be a true representative of Consciousness because he will know and will enforce the purpose and the law of Consciousness

on earth with the consent and assistance of his highly devoted, highly self-conscious followers. He and his group together will function as a single individual, a single organism, displaying that splendour and beauty, latent in the nature of Consciousness, of which we can have no knowledge at present.

In so far as the animals feel attracted towards their own kind, they feel repelled from other animals which do not belong to their kind. Since each species that came into existence in the course of evolution had its sphere of affection and sympathy confined to its own members, it resulted in the mutual war of species in which the fittest as well as the most promising species alone survived. The natural attraction of the animal for animals of its own kind and repulsion from those not of its kind was intended by nature also to serve the useful purpose of intensifying the struggle for existence which is an indispensable condition of the evolution of life.

The tendency of Consciousness for organization and group-life is expressed by it not only in the human and the animal stage but also in the material stage, for example, in the atoms, the molecules, the crystals, the snow-flakes, the systems of heavenly bodies, etc.

In brief, the social instinct of the animal is an outcome of the essential nature of Consciousness. It is based on life's quality of oneness and its consequent urge to maintain this oneness. It is a part of that fundamental urge of life to seek its wholeness which has been previously described as love or as the urge of consciousness. In the animal stage this urge is suppressed and appears only in the form of automatic and inflexible tendencies, the instincts, the object of which is to secure for the animal the preservation of its life or the completeness of its body. One of these tendencies takes the form of an automatic and compulsory attraction for the kind and is known as the herd instinct. But the urge of consciousness becomes free when consciousness obtains its freedom in man. In the human stage, there-

fore, it appears as a free desire for the ideal and its object is to secure for man the completeness of his self. An aspect of this free desire for an ideal is the attraction which a man feels for other men having the same ideal. In as much as this attraction is voluntary, being a part of the urge of consciousness, it must be distinguished from that involuntary tendency known as the herd instinct, which man possesses in common with other animals but which, in his case, is ruled by the urge of consciousness for the ideal. Fundamentally, however, this attraction is the same tendency of life which remains inflexible in the animal stage in the shape of the herd instinct only, it becomes free in the human being and, when it does so, it emerges as a voluntary attachment for men loving the same ideal. Thus the herd instinct is common to man and animal but man's attraction for other men of the same ideal, like his attraction for the ideal, is the privilege of man alone.

Since the unconscious urge of all human beings is the same, they have, in addition to their special love for men of the same ideal, a general love for all other human beings irrespective of their ideals. In the case of a group of men having the same ideal, these two forms of love support and reinforce each other. But the latter form of love cannot have its own way with respect to men whose ideal is different from our own, as long as we feel that they are opposing our ideal. It is overruled by our hatred for every thing that is actually or potentially a source of danger to our ideal. The love of our ideal impels us to hate and oppose all other ideals and, in so far as these men become identified with the opposition of rival ideals, we are impelled to hate and oppose them too. In spite of it, however, our affinity for them as human beings is always there and shows itself whenever we are assured that their actual or potential opposition has ceased to exist. We are kind and generous to a vanquished enemy because his ideal no longer opposes our own and the love of man for man is free to have its way.

Since our love for other men is derived from the same

source from which our love for the ideal is derived, it is at its best and highest towards human beings who have the same ideal as our own. The desire for social life in man, his altruism or his love of fellowmen, is not due to the maternal instinct as McDougall has held or to the herd-instinct as W. A. Trotter has believed but it is due to the urge of consciousness itself. It is a part of the urge for the ideal. Both the maternal instinct and the herd instinct are compulsory, automatic tendencies fashioned out of the basic urge of consciousness to seek its oneness or wholeness. The urge of human consciousness wants to express itself not only in the love of the Divine Self but also in *the love of the human selves.* The latter type of love, no less than the former has to be awakened or liberated from the rule of instincts and wrong ideals which dominate it; and because it has the same root as the former the way in which it can be awakened or liberated is the same as that in which the former type of love can be awakened or liberated, that is, by strengthening the impulse for the Right Ideal and developing the consciousness of self through worship and ethical discipline.

Since it is only a self-conscious man who has a lofty ideal, he alone can love all human beings equally (in so far as the love of the ideal does not create a difference in his love in favour of men of his own ideal) sincerely and selflessly, irrespective of their race, nation, caste, country, class or colour. Such a person cannot really hate men although there is no doubt that he must hate their ideals when they are wrong. But his hatred of men's ideals is the natural, inevitable result of that love from which alone a sincere, disinterested love of all men can result. Every love has its antithesis. The disinterested love of all men is a part of the love of the Right Ideal. It is, therefore, subserved by the hatred of all wrong ideals. It may seem paradoxical, yet it is true that the hatred of a highly self-conscious man for wrong ideals is an indispensable part of that love without which the love of men as men and irrespective of their

beliefs would be impossible. The hatred of such a man is confined strictly to men's ideals and does not extend in the least to their caste, colour, country, race, class or nationality. Leaving aside the wrong ideals for which they stand and which he cannot but hate, he loves them wholly and completely. It is his misfortune in one respect no less than it is his good fortune in another respect that he has to hate them, to oppose them and fight them, sometimes desperately and ruthlessly, in so far as they represent and become identified with the resistance of wrong ideals and as such act as an impediment to the evolution of life.

The oneness of man is a corollary from the oneness of consciousness. The human selves are rushing out of consciousness as sparks from a bonfire or as drops from a huge fountain but unlike the sparks or the drops they want to go back to their source and the source also wants to come forward towards them. Every part of consciousness, we may imagine, wants to maintain its wholeness by rushing forward to all the other parts. Every human self wants to achieve its wholeness not only by going forward to meet its source which itself goes forward to meet it but also by taking other parts of Consciousness, that is, other human selves, along with it. The efforts of every self for the achievement of its ideal indeed become easier when they are made in a group but the important point is that they are *right* only when they are made in a group. The reason is that it is then only that they are fully in accordance with, and fully expressive of, the nature of self. We are right only when we are expressing our nature fully and freely. Every self is a part of a group and can, therefore, achieve its ideal as well as its own perfection only in a group. The prophet who ordered his followers to pray together in the form of a disciplined and organised group had really attained to and succeeded in expressing a very high knowledge of self.

Lest the reader should fall into an error by the mention of parts of consciousness, it is necessary to repeat here, what

has been mentioned already in the chapter on Ethics, that really there are no parts of consciousness. Consciousness is one and indivisible, unbegetting and unbegettable, without a peer or a partner. All creation is going on within consciousness and not outside it. It is the thought or the feeling of consciousness that is evolving and expressing itself in the form of creation.

Steps of evolution in the animal stage take the form of species but in the human stage they take the form of ideals. Just as a species forms a group by itself, so men having the same ideal form a group by themselves. So natural and essential is it for an individual to seek the company of other individuals who love his ideal that we cannot think of an ideal without a group. The consideration that the self gains in power for the achievement of its ideal by living in a group is not the fundamental cause of the formation of an ideal-group. The attraction for men of the same ideal, like the attraction for the ideal, has its source in the urge of consciousness to seek its oneness or wholeness. Men loving the same ideal form a group, moreover, not only on account of their attraction for each other and for the ideal but also on account of their natural and justified repulsion from other ideals. Their repulsion from other ideals arises, of course, in the service of the love that they feel for their own ideal. A man who does not hate other ideals does not love his own.

The love that a man feels for other men as human beings is due to the ultimate oneness of all human selves. Every human self is connected with every other human self through its un-conscious mind. The conscious minds of the selves are different but their unconscious mind is the same and that is the Conscious Mind of the Universe. The selves are like innumerable bubbles on the same lake or like innumerable taps of water connected under ground with the same reservoir, where the lake or the reservoir may be imagined to stand for the Consciousness of the Universe. But the selves become conscious of their fudamental one-

ness completely when they have the same ideal, that is, when their conscious mind (and not merely their unconscious mind) is one. Permanent unity will come to the human race not only when their conscious mind is the same but also when their conscious and unconscious mind is the same, that is, not only when they have the same ideal and form a single ideal-group but also when their ideal is the Right Ideal.

Like the gregarious and the herd instincts, the innate tendencies of imitation, suggestion, suggestibility, sympathy and sympathetic induction in the animals are fashioned out of the urge of consciousness to function as a whole or in a group. Naturally, all these tendencies persist in man but they also take a second birth in him, or rather, regain their freedom in him as some of the functions or qualities of his free consciousness. Man exprenes these tendencies voluntarily for the sake of the ideal when the love of the ideal is strong enough to dominate him and also involuntarily like an animal when the instinct is dominating him and the love of the ideal is either weak or is allowed to be forgotten. Individuals who begin to act in a group often forget the demands of their ideal and do not stop to consider how far they can go with the group consistently with these demands. They are led away by what is known as a "mob psychology". They may start acting in a group because the demands of the ideal and the demands of the group-instincts agree with each other but as they proceed their instincts, which function involuntarily have the better of their ideal which requires voluntary action, with the result that they begin to act in the group almost entirely involuntarily. But the danger to the ideal involved in acting with a group can be avoided when the group is following a reliable leader. The love of a man living in a group, of which the ideal is different from his own, suffers from a huge disadvantage on account of the impulsion of his involuntary tendencies to act in a group. He is impelled to act not in accordance with the needs of his own ideal but in accordance with the needs of the ideal of

men surrounding him. He has, therefore, a tendency to change over more and more to the ideal of these men. But when a man is living among men whose ideal is the same as his own, these tendencies of his nature aid his love and thereby fulfil the purpose for which they are meant. They no longer interfere with the urge of self. On the other hand they serve the ideal and favour his urge to act in a group in accordance with the demands of the ideal.

By living in a group the power of each self to achieve its ideal is enhanced only in proportion to the strength and the internal harmony of the group. The amount of internal co-herence and harmony of the group depends upon their love for the ideal. It increases as the love of the ideal increases and decreases as the love of the ideal decreases. When the ideal's love decreases, it is due to the fact that other impulses, inimical to the ideal and encroaching upon the love claimed by the ideal, gain in strength. In extreme cases these impulses oust the ideal and form new ideals themsleves so that we have quarrels, civil wars, rebellions and revolutions within the group. An ideal group or a society cannot live without an internal organization or a government. Every ideal-group must have its own government otherwise it will not be able to serve its own ideal but the ideal of the rulers. Every government represents an ideal and serves an ideal-group. All the activities of a government are controlled by the ideal that it stands for. Politics, like Ethics, is not a separate science. It is the image of our ideals. It is simply a reflection of our views on life generally. As every ideal has its own Ethics so every ideal has its own Politics, its own ideas and theories of the constitution and management of human societies.

An ideal-group or a group of men organized under an ideal of life, is always a state. It is always politically sovereign and independent or else it is only a group of slaves toiling for the ideal of their masters who have an ideal-group of their own.

But an ideal group may have a large number of groups

within it organised for the sake of a host of specific ends subserving the ideal. Such groups are the political, literary, scientific, industrial, commercial, financial, legal, recreational, educational, municipal and other bodies, associations and societies within a state, like clubs, corporations, universities, schools, colleges, trade unions, banks, firms, factories etc. Such groups are always subservient to the state and its ideal and that is why the state allows them to exist and flourish. Each of them is ultimately controlled by the state very strictly. The state gives each of them its particular form or constitution and particular policy, programme or outlook. As the knowledge of mankind is growing their realization of the various ends capable of sub-serving their ideals and of the importance of spontaneous, collective effort for the achievement of these ends is also growing. Hence the number and power of such bodies is daily increasing in every country. This has led some philosophers to imagine as if these bodies will ultimately replace the state. This is a mistake resulting from a gross ignorance of the laws of human nature. If ever the state ceases to exist on account of the growing number and power of such bodies, it will only split up into a number of different states. Each of these bodies consists of human beings who must have an ideal of life. Hence each of them can exist only as a body which is either sub-servient to the ideal of the state or which has its own ideal and is, therefore, politically sovereign. Unless each of them is sub-serving the same ideal, each will come into a clash with all the others, so that, ultimately, each will discover that it cannot function, unless it is able to control the entire life of its members, *i.e.* unless it becomes a state.

All human history is the history of ideals, of their emergence, rise, climax, decline and disappearance and the history of the race is repeated on a small scale in the life of the individual.

We have seen that the ideals of the individual continue to evolve from childhood onwards till the end of his life.

In childhood the earliest form of the ideal is the pleasure derived from instinctive desires. Later on, it is parents or teachers or those persons in the social circle of the child whom he admires. Gradually his ideals, which are many in the beginning, rise higher and higher and become less and less in number till only one remains. Even this one ideal has a further course of evolution till it reaches the Right Ideal. The Right Ideal too has its own course of evolution which ends with the achievement of the highest self-consciousness. The cause of all this evolution is the self's desire for Beauty which the individual continues to understand ever more and more. As his ideal rises higher and higher in the scale of Beauty, his sympathies become more and more universal and extend from his person to his family, his friends, his school, his country or tribe, his village or city, his nation and, finally, to the whole of humanity.

Generally the evolution of the ideals of an individual ends with the ideal of the society or the state of which he is a member, no matter how low that ideal may be. The whole psychological atmosphere of the individual which includes the home, the school, the street and the society at large is charged so heavily with educative influences calculated to engender, nourish and sustain a powerful belief in the ideal of the state that it is very rare that an individual is able to rise above that ideal. Every individual, who comes into the world as a member of this society, imbibes the love of his ideal unconsciously by a direct psychological contact with them. This is how belief in an ideal is passed on from generation to generation and an ideal-group is able to maintain its solidarity and continue its life for centuries. Whenever an individual comes to believe in an ideal which is a little different from the ideal of the society of which he is member, he is dubbed by the society as a rebel or a revolutionary.

The human society has been evolving its ideals more or less in the same way in which the individual does. The

primitive man followed his own instinctive desires. Later on, his desires became complicated and modified by his sympathies for the family. Subsequently, he learnt to sacrifice some of his personal and family interests for the general good of the tribe which became his ideal in common with other members of the tribe. The tribes were many and they fought with one another till they discovered the truth that tribal warfare was suicidal and felt the need of combining under a king who, thereby, came to have a piece of land to rule. The king became the ideal of the subjects and was invested with a 'divine right'. But shortly the greed and tyranny of the king drew attention to the fact that no ideal could be good enough which neglected the welfare of the common people, which, of course, meant the people in the country. This shifted the ideal from the king to the country and to the people in the country. It changed from the idea of the divine right of one person to the idea of the sanctity of the nation or to nationalism. The good of the nation required that it should rule itself; therefore the ideal rose higher and came to be expressed by the words democracy, liberty, fraternity, equality and freedom, which terms, however, had still a limited sense because they were applicable to the members of a limited group of people, a nation, living within definite geographical limits.

Till the end of the First World War societies were at this stage of evolution throughout the world. But since that war the ideals of the human society have taken an important step forward in their progress. From ideals they have become ideologies or philosophies of life, *e.g.* Fascism and Communism, each of which professes to be a complete explanation of existence. The sympathies of one of these ideologies, I mean Communism, are no longer confined to any particular race or nation but extend to the whole world. They are completely universal. Thus we have come a step nearer the final ideology which will be a complete philosophy of life with universal sympathies. Like the ideals of the individuals the ideals of human societies have

advanced from the concrete to the abstract and from the less perfect and less universal to the more perfect and the more universal. On the whole they have made a greater and greater approach to the qualities of Beauty. In the *theory* of Russian Communism in particular we see two aspects of the final ideology, those of economic equality and universality, revealing themselves already at this stage of our evolution. But since these aspects of Beauty are consistent only with the Right Ideal, it is impossible for Russian Communism to achieve them actually in *practice*.

The evolution of social ideals is again due to our desire for Beauty which is internal and which we understand ever more and more with our advancing experience and knowledge. Unfortunately, the knowledge of Beauty comes too often through bitter experience. We get a fresh glimpse of beauty only when action, experience and long mutual relationship of the self and the ideal have proved the futility of the ideal. Our inner criterion of Beauty never fails but we learn to apply it only gradually by experience. Every ideal which cannot come up to our inner standard of beauty breaks up in the long run. Every state of society is unstable and waits for its inevitable dissolution, if it is not a state determined and created by the Right Ideal.

But the inner weakness of a wrong ideal is not the only cause of its disruption. An ideal is being continually opposed by other ideals and is involved in a struggle for existence which it can survive only if it is the best and the fittest of them.

The ideal-groups in which humanity is divided at present take the place of species in which the animal world was divided before the appearance of man. An ideal-group behaves like a living organism and is subject to laws which are similar to the laws of Biology. Every ideal-group has the will to live and to grow indefinitely. Like an organism it has a purpose which is the ideal, meets with resistance in its efforts to achieve that purpose, exerts itself to overcome resistance, increases and enlarges its powers

through exertion and becomes weak when it fails to exert itself or gives up effort. Like an organism, it can die owing to an internal disease which, in its case, is caused by the elements of imperfection in the ideal or can be overpowered and annihilated by other ideal-groups in their mutual struggle for existence. Just as an organism gains in health and strength when there is a perfect co-ordination of its various parts and their functions, so an ideal-group gains in strength and efficiency when it is able to achieve a unity of purpose and a measure of internal organization among its members. Like an organism it is attracted by objects that help it or support its life and growth and is repelled by objects that have the contrary effect. As the life of an organism is centered around the brain, so the life of an ideal-group is centered around a leader.

Every ideal is a challenge to every other ideal and aims at getting power, extending the sphere of its influence and increasing the number of its helpers and adherents at the expense of all other ideals. Thus, ever since man has become conscious of himself, there has proceeded an unending war of ideal-groups in the human society. The whole of the history of our race is nothing but a record of the struggle of ideals.

Just as an ideal-group resembles an organism, the war of ideals in the human world resembles the war of species which we had in the animal world before the appearance of man. If an ideal-group fails to prove its strength in the mutual war of ideals, it is defeated in the struggle for existence, is enslaved by other ideals and is thus wiped out entirely. The moment an ideal reconciles itself to slavery, it dies. When an ideal is enslaved completely, it no longer exists for itself; it becomes subservient to the enslaving ideal and it is, therefore, the ruling ideal that exists by itself and not the serving ideal. When slavery is accepted by an ideal rather than opposed by it, as much as it is possible to oppose it, it is literally the complete obliteration of the ideal. But if the opposition continues, even to a small

extent, the ideal is alive.

The internal elements of imperfection or the weaknesses of an ideal, which are latent and hidden in the beginning, become manifest at a time when the ideal is passing through a crisis of its external struggle, that is, when the ideal is faced with the necessity of exerting the whole of its strength in order to overcome a danger to its life. It is like a man feeling some of his worst weaknesses, never realized before, at a time when he is required to put up a hard effort. If the ideal is internally strong, it can withstand the struggle much better.

As soon as an ideal has come into existence, its conflict with all the other ideals has begun. The conflict is a life and death struggle which continues, for centuries if necessary, so long as the ideal is not wiped out itself or until it has wiped out all the other ideals. Every ideal-group is always either actually attacking other ideal-groups or preparing for an attack. The object of attack is the destruction or the enslavement of the rival ideal or ideals and it must therefore, take a form that is most effective for the speedy achievement of this object. As such, it must make use of violence as soon as it is both necessary and possible. Violence is possible only when the ideal has reached a definite stage in the growth of its power in relation to other ideals; it is necessary only when it feels that its purposes are meeting with resistance, which can be overcome by violence alone. Since every ideal wants to grow in strength at the expense of all other ideals, a stage must come in its history, sooner or later, when the use of violence becomes both possible and necessary.

The preparation for the final attack continues so long as the attack is not able to take the most effective form for the achievement of its object. In the meantime the attack assumes non-violent shapes like propaganda and criticism in the form of speeches, articles, pamphlets, public statements, radio programmes, processions, meetings and resolutions or non-co-operation, diplomatic missions,

conferences, compromises, treaties, sanctions, appeals, aids, bribes, temptations, threats and persuasions. The object of all these devices and activities is to put the rival ideal under a disadvantage and to gain an advantage for one's own ideal on which further advantages may be built. The preparation for the final attack is embodied in all those activities the object of which is to increase the internal solidarity and cohesion of the group, the numerical, moral and material power of its members and their love or attachment to the ideal. These include the physical, mental and moral training of the individual. With the increase of knowledge the methods of attack and preparation have gradually evolved in efficiency and have now reached an astonishing degree of refinement. The success of every non-violent attack adds to the group's strength and to its preparation for the final violent attack intended to win the final victory and weakens the rival ideal in the same proportion.

Non-violent methods of attack have to be resorted to by the ideal as long as it is weak and pending the development of a sufficient power; but when non-violence is a part of the ideal itself, the ideal has no chance of gaining or maintaining its freedom. If it is enslaved and gains its freedom by the automatic break-up of the enslaving wrong ideal, it will not be able to maintain it and another ideal must enslave it again.

Defensive opposition, as a principle to be observed for all time, is no more compatible with the ideal's will to live than non-violent opposition is. In fact, it is not possible to make any distinction between offence and defence as long as the object of both is victory. As long as your motive is to overpower the enemy or to see him weaker than yourself it is all the same whether you ward off an attack *before* it is delivered or *after* it is delivered.

Whether you fight in defence or offence you cannot succeed unless you maintain your strength at a level far above that of the enemy. Every war begins long before

it develops into an armed clash. Before every war there is a war of preparations which you must win if you are to succeed in your armed defence of the future. If you permit the enemy to prepare himself and grow stronger than yourself, you have failed in your defence. If your own preparations do not excel those of the enemy, your defence will certainly fail; you have, therefore, lost the struggle already. If on the other hand, they excel those of the enemy and you refuse to deliver the attack, as a matter of principle, and wait for the attack of the enemy, you permit him to carry on his preparations till they exceed your own. As such, you have already offered yourself to be defeated in the battle of defence that you are expecting to give. It follows that offence is simply the most effective form of defence. Like non-violent opposition the so-called defensive opposition is only an indication that the group is yet preparing for the final violent attack. Non-violent opposition only precedes violent opposition when the latter has to be delayed on account of weakness or necessity. No ideal that has the will to live can stick to non-violent or defensive methods of opposition permanently.

The struggle of ideals, whether it is open or concealed, warlike or peaceful, violent or non-violent, whether for a time it takes the form of a battle-field or a conference, continues for ever without stopping. Sometimes two or more ideals, hostile to each other, may combine against another ideal or a similar combination of other ideals. But the allies are, all the time, the secret enemies of each other and as soon as their common enemies are defeated their mutual animosities which were concealed for a time, as a matter of expediency, are allowed to come to the surface again.

Just as the struggle of species in the animal stage of evolution resulted in the appearance of man, the perfect animal, similarly the struggle of ideal-groups will result in the appearance of the Final Ideal-Group or the Group of the Perfect Ideal. Every wrong ideal is being smashed from

without and being disrupted from within and every wrong ideal that breaks up is succeeded by an ideal which is a step nearer to the final ideal in some respects. We are never absolutely wrong but we advance from a lower to a higher truth, from a less perfect ideal to a more perfect ideal. A time must, therefore, come when the most perfect ideal makes its appearance. From the moment it does so, it will continue to grow in power and influence at the expense of all other ideals, which will become less and less in number, till it has spread to the whole world and brought the whole of humanity within its fold.

We have seen that every ideal-group behaves like a living organism. The group of the Right Ideal will be no exception to this rule. It will also behave like an organism. All the laws of nature that apply to other ideal-groups must apply to it. Resistance will be ready for it when it comes into the world. It will struggle for its life, it will meet resistance and overcome it and, thereby, enlarge its powers more and more. It will ultimately over-power all other ideal-groups and break all their resistance because :—

(1) It will be a higher and a more powerful form of life than all other ideal-groups;

(2) It will accord with our inner-most nature and give us a perfect satisfaction ;

(3) Every other ideal competing with it will contain within itself the principle of its own annihilation;

(4) All the forces of evolution including the advancement of knowledge will be in its favour.

The history of evolution reveals to us the fact that, throughout in the past, the highest form of life was always able to have the better of the lower forms, which were weak intrinsically and unable to compete with it in the long run. Whenever life jumps to a higher level, it does so in order to rise still higher. Whenever life wins a victory or gains an advantage, it maintains it, builds upon it and extends it further. Life achieved a great victory at the appearance of the first living cell and it was maintained till

the world was filled with innumerable species of animals. It gained another great victory at the appearance of the first man and it was maintained till man was able to fill the whole world, over-powering and enslaving all other forms of life. The emergence of the Final Ideology will be similarly another major victory of life which it will continue to extend till the ideology is able to spread to the whole world, overpowering the opposition of all other ideologies. The progress of man will enter a new era when that ideology has conquered finally. Resistance to life will end in the form of ideal groups but will take another form and our efforts to overcome it will enable us to discover in us powers of which we can hardly dream at present. As long as we live in this world, we shall continue to meet resistance which is the direct result of the tendency of consciousness to move forward and forward always like a swiftly running stream. If resistance does not come to meet consciousness, consciousness must go forward to meet resistance on account of its very nature to press on. It conquers resistance and thereby develops itself. Resistance is created by consciousness because it must have new purposes to achieve. Resistance would have no meaning if consciousness did not take it as resistance to itself, to its purposes. It is possible that one day we shall meet resistance from the stars and feel the necessity to conquer them.

Thus a study of the nature of consciousness leads us to the conclusion that the Right Ideology will emerge and expand as a result of struggle. Struggle will be essential not only for its emergence and expansion but also for its survival and maintenance, after it has once conquered all other ideals and ideologies. Like an organism it must struggle as long as it has the will to live and grow and must die when it gives up the struggle. Whether the struggle will be at any time violent or non-violent will be determined entirely by the circumstances. The object of struggle is victory achieved as quickly and as completely as possible. Therefore the struggle is bound to assume a form which is most

effective for the achievement of this object. One can assume that it would take the form of an attack as violent and as destructive for the opposing ideal as possible, so that all opposition is finished once for all and the ideal has a perfectly smooth way for itself. But although it must happen ultimately, it will not be possible in the beginning. It will require time and preparation. In the meantime non-violent methods of attack will have to be relied upon out of a necessity. But the object of attack will be secured ultimately by violence to which the ideal will have to resort sooner or later.

Supposing, on account of the internal disruption of all wrong ideals, the right ideal, pledged to non-violence spreads automatically throughout the world at any time without striking a blow. Then, if it fails to defend itself, it must break up into innumerable ideal-groups again. It will be impossible for it to live and grow without struggle. The moment it will give up struggle it will stop its progress. It can achieve no victory without struggle and, if it does achieve it, it cannot maintain it without struggle.

War can be stopped only by war. War, when fought in the service of truth and virtue, is not a sin. Peace can be secured only through war and in no other way. We can bring about peace by fighting and not by writing or talking. Humanity will be united only by the Right Ideal. So long as it does not emerge and until it spreads to the whole world, the bloody struggle of ideals will continue. It will go on increasing in force and vehemence making use of ever more and more efficient weapons of war, till one day the eyes of a section of humanity, who will be surely the most advanced section of it, and perhaps the greatest to suffer from the hardships of a prolonged warfare, will be opened to the great idea of the future. Self-Consciousness and slavery are terms in-compatible with each other and, since this section of humanity will become self-conscious, their first concern will be to free themselves from the bondage of the ruling ideal. Their victory will, however, be neither

sudden nor easy. It will come naturally at the end of a considerable period of struggle or preparation, during which they will wait for a suitable opportunity to strike the final blow. The preparation will aim at educating and training the largest possible number of men for courage, co-operation. discipline (depending upon absolute obedience to a leader once chosen for his reliability) self-control and and self-sacrifice—qualities which will grow with the increasing self-consciousness of the individual. The opportunity will arrive when the ruling wrong ideal has been sufficiently weakened or spent up morally and materially, being, on the one hand, exhausted on account of a series of long wars and, on the other hand, compelled by events to suspect highly its own truth; in other words, when the natural, inevitable disruption of the ideal is at hand. When this happens, the propaganda and persuasions of self-conscious men will gain in effectiveness; they will begin to look more convincing. The numbers of these men will therefore, swell quickly till they become powerful enough to overthrow the government.

Having taken possession of the machinery of government they will apply themselves to the task of conveying its fullest benefits, economic and moral, to the individual and the society. They will remodel education to suit the new ideal. They will use the school, the press, the platform, the radio and the cinema to free the individual from all enslaving influences of other ideals. The material resources will be developed as fully as possible and put into the service of the ideal. Thus the ideal will grow in power in every way. The very existence of a powerful state of the Right Ideal will be a message of death to all other ideals which will feel their internal shortcomings more and more as time goes on and will continue to become hollow from within. When the time comes for an armed clash, the Right Ideology may sometimes win and sometimes lose but it can never lose the final battle of its war with other ideals. The courage and confidence of its armies will be unique and

unparalleled because, while its believers will be sure of their victory, they will not be afraid of death.

Death is a message of joy rather than a source of fear for a self-conscious man because he is sure that he does not die, and what is known as death is only a change for the better in the career of his self, a step from a lower to a higher stage of its evolution. To live, according to him, means to attack resistance and thereby to gain in self-consciousness and to die means to yield to it and thus to lose in self-consciousness. Death is sweet to him because it always brings him nearer to his goal; it is the successful end of a series of trials and struggles for a better life. What he fears is not death but that fear of death which may become an obstacle in the way of his love. He loves death when it holds for him a promise to rise to a higher level of self-consciousness and to make a further approach to the Beloved. Death is then a message of a new life and a new joy for him. He makes the best possible use of his life to achieve the highest self-consciousness possible and it is his wish of a life-time that he may make death too an instrument of a higher progress for himself and, when the fondly awaited opportunity arrives, his joy knows no bounds. It is death that is his prey and not he that is the prey of death.

We hoped that we shall win a permanent peace at the end of the Second World War. But surely the peace that has come is no more than an interval of preparations for another war. Wars must continue so long as we do not choose the Right Ideal. There can be no permanent peace unless we discover our ideal and adopt it. So long as we are unable to find it, nature wants us to go on fighting among ourselves in order that we may discover it in this way. It is nature's method of evolving the Right Ideology. We cannot oppose nature nor interfere with its purposes by any number of peace conferences, disarmament schemes or plans of a new world order in the East or West. The Final Ideology is the only natural and stable foundation of our unity and brotherhood. Unity on any other basis will

be difficult to achieve and, if achieved to maintain. We cannot hope to unite ourselves by a World-Federation of nations or by a League of Nations backed by a military power or by an organisation or brotherhood of nations of any other type or quality as long as our ideals remain different from each other and different from the Right Ideal. If they remain different from each other, no lasting compromise among them in the form of a federation or union of nations will be possible. Every ideal wants unlimited expansion for itself and a time must soon come when the mutual friction of ideals, their open or secret resistance to each other, must upset the artificial unity. No treaties, pledges or charters can stand against the forces of our nature. We cannot defy our nature even if we all agree to do so. Whenever peace is established finally on the earth, it will come to us not because we shall succeed in harmonizing conflicting ideals, which is impossible, but because one ideal will overpower and oust all the other ideals. This ideal can be only the Right Ideal. The human race can, no doubt, achieve its unity if all accept the same wrong ideal but the unity achieved in this way will not be a permanent one. A wrong ideal is based on a part of our nature and not on the whole of it, It must, therefore, break up, sooner or later, into a number of different ideals.

All moves for the unity of ideal-groups or states having different ideals must fail because they are unscientific and wrong. They are due to our ignorance of the laws of human nature. Conflicting ideals and ideologies can have no basis for even a partial real unity. Nations, for example, can never agree to a common world-army to serve as a world-police, unless they all have the same ideal.

Some of us have welcomed the invention of the atom bomb or the hydrogen bomb as a threat to the safety of all nations which must render international wars impossible. But the discovery of the atom bomb or other similar or worse instruments of mass-annihilation of humanity cannot stop the war of ideals which is dictated by the urge of our

nature and which must run its course to the end. At the most the use of all such weapons, like the use of the poison-gas, may be stopped by means of international agreements, which every nation may have to respect for the sake of its own safety. A serious common danger may force a number of ideal-groups to agree temporarily and artificially in certain things in order to defend themselves against that danger but it cannot remove those inward hostilities of nations which have their root in the insistent and imperative demands of their ideals.

Provided war is necessitated by the Right Ideal, the hatred or the cruelty involved in it will not be a sin but a virtue. Hate is a reaction of love. We cannot love one thing without hating something else that is the opposite of our love and our hate is in proportion to our love. The purpose of hate is to clear the path of love, to approach nearer to the beloved object and to love it more ardently. Such a war will be a direct and conscious help to evolution and we have defined moral action as that action which helps evolution directly and consciously. Such a war is a creative activity and nature itself has fought innumerable such wars and perpetrated such apparent cruelties in the animal world in the past. Man is a co-worker with the Divine Self in Its activities and purposes. The creation of the World is not yet over. We, as human beings are, to share this creation with the Consciousness of the Universe. It is as moral for us to be cruel and violent, at times, in the interest of creation, as it is for the World-Self to be so.

The war of species staged by nature in the animal world was not a cruelty. It was not a destructive but a constructive activity. There is no construction which does not involve some destruction. A gardener cannot maintain the beauty of his garden without cutting the unnecessary rank growth under the trees and in the flower beds. The use of the scythe is as necessary for him as sowing the seeds and watering and manuring the plants. Before a tailor prepares a coat, he cuts the cloth into several pieces out of which

some are discarded and others are made use of.

War is not only consistent with the Right Ideal but it is required imperatively by this ideal very often. The reason is that self-consciousness cannot grow in conditions of slavery. War will not be wrong when it will be fought by highly self-conscious men. It will rather meet its justification for the first time at their hands. That will be the first occasion in the history of war when it will be consciously and directly a help to the world, when it will be fought really for the sake of peace, freedom and progress and when it will really establish the unity of mankind and turn mankind into a single family. Because a novice would spoil the garden by his unskilful use of the scythe, it does not mean that its use is not necessary at all for the proper care of the garden or that an expert should not be permitted to use it at all. Since a wise gardener will use it consistently with the general scheme of the garden, in his hands it will be in no way less useful than the watering and manuring of plants, although it will not grow the plants but cut them. A righteous war is similarly a moral and constructive and not an immoral or destructive activity.

Hatred is essential to love. The course of love never runs smoothly. Love always meets with obstacles and, if it does not remove them, it cannot grow. Just as there is only one love that is right, there is only one hatred that is right and it is that hatred which subserves the Right Love. The self acquires power and progress by aggression; therefore hatred is helpful to the self. Aggression is the result and the expression of hatred. Love implies a striving for a fuller and richer intercourse with its object. Everything that favours this effort becomes itself an object of love and everything that opposes this effort becomes an object of hatred. Impediments in the way of love are stimulants of love. A genuine and sincere love is created by difficulties and disappointments. Hate serves the growth of love in two ways; directly, by removing the impeding factors and,

indirectly, by fixing the attention on the beloved object which leads to a greater realization of its beauty. It brings the lover nearer to the beloved by calling attention to the latter's beauty. In so far as you have destroyed the object of hate you have availed yourself of a richer and fuller intercourse with the object of love; you have discovered more of its beauty and richness. This is the foundation of the idea of the devil in religion.

While love grows, hatred goes on decreasing because, while love seeks a greater and greater contact with the beloved, hatred aims at severing its connections more and more from its object. Hatred wears itself out as the object of hate is destroyed and shifts to some new object which may be offering resistance to love. So long as the world does not reach its perfection, hatred must continue because so long there must remain something or another to obstruct the way to the perfection of the world and, therefore, to necessitate hatred and opposition on the part of self-conscious men.

The devil, understood in this sense, that is, as representing all influences that act as an impediment on life, is a necessity for evolution. The Universe, as it is, could not have existed without the devil as there would have been no evolution and no progress without him. To be aggressive against the forces of the devil is to progress. The devil serves a spiritual purpose. The Right Ideology will not progress unless it meets resistance and overcomes it. Should it, when it comes into existence, find that it is perfectly free and has no resistance to meet from other ideals, it will be unable to come into its own. It will lack the incentive to realize itself and the result will be that it will distintegrate and find itself sorrounded by the resistance of wrong ideals on all sides which it will have to conquer for its freedom. It will be unable to maintain that freedom which comes to it without effort. Even when freedom is achieved by effort, continuous effort will be essential in order to maintain it.

Effort or endeavour is as much the life-principle of an

ideal-group as it is the life principle of an organism. It seems to be an unfailing law that life can achieve or maintain no advantage which it does not earn by a hard effort. It is so to say, boring for itself a tunnel out of a mountain of hard rocks and can go along it only as far as it is able to dig it out and no further. Man would sink to the level of brutes even today if it were not for the fact that he has learnt the value of knowledge and culture by his efforts and is keeping them up by his efforts.

In the mutual struggle of ideals an ideal can oppose and weaken another ideal by methods which are either violent or non-violent. Non-violent methods of weakening the rival ideal include propaganda, persuading, reasoning or arguing by means of word written or spoken. But an ideal's struggle for expansion cannot and does not remain confined to these methods alone. They are no doubt the only methods possible in periods of slavery or weakness and they are extremely important and useful under all circumstances but neither can their result keep pace with the ideal's own ever-increasing demands for expansion nor can they meet effectively all those methods which a rival militant ideal must naturally employ for its expansion at the cost of other ideals.

The ideal is a part of the self; it completes the self so that the self and the ideal become a single whole. The self feels uneasy and miserable when efforts are made to separate it from the ideal; it resists such efforts. The fact that men hold to their ideals tenaciously and obstinately is,therefore, quite natural. It is this natural tenacity and obstinacy which makes it difficult even for a skilful debater to dissuade a person from the love of an ideal, however wrong, by giving reasons and arguments against it. A strong love listens to no arguments against itself. A lover's mind is never open to views, however sound, which go against the beloved. Men who already love an ideal whole-heartedly are too unreasonable and too obstinate to be won over by another ideal by mere arguments. How can love be over-

powered by reason which is its servant and not its master? Love rather justfies and rationalizes itself with the help of reason. It is only a weak and disappointed love that reason can defeat but then, in such a case, it is love itself that has withdrawn and not reason that has defeated it!

The tendency of self to persist in loving obstinately an ideal that it has once come to love (whether the ideal is right or wrong) reinforces itself considerably when the ideal is free, well-organised and well-defended. In such a case the ideal builds for itself a strong, extensive and complicated machinery of education which supports, feeds and nourishes the ideal and maintains the self's love for it at as high a level as possible. In such a case the ideal is able to protect its adherents against the influences or the education of a rival aggressive ideal by banning the latter's propaganda, written or spoken, as far as it is necessary and possible and also by meeting its propaganda and education by a skilfully-managed, effective counter-propaganda and counter-education of its own. Naturally, the self is too ready to be impressed by educative influences that favour its own ideal and therefore becomes safe from such influences of the opposing ideal.

People's obstinacy in sticking to their ideals serves a useful purpose because on account of it they are able to offer resistance and opposition to other ideals and invite resistance and opposition to their own. In its absence no hard effort and, therefore, no progress would be possible. It gives that definiteness, that independent existence and stability, to an ideal-group on account of which the mutual war of ideals, so essential for evolution, becomes possible. Because obstinacy is natural and useful, it does not follow that we can or we should tolerate it. Its very usefulness depends upon the fact that it invites opposition and offers opposition, that is, upon the fact that it has to be crushed. Obstinacy can be crushed not by reasons and arguments, which go home only when love is on the decline but by capturing the freedom of an ideal.

When we conquer and enslave an ideal, we interfere with its healthy life as an organism. It is wounded and paralysed and may linger on as a cripple but cannot function for the maintenance of its health and growth; it becomes weaker and weaker day by day. Between the freedom and the slavery of an ideal there is the difference of a vigorous health and a mortal or dangerous disease, if not actually of life and death. If an ideal-group is like an organism, the various departments of the government that it sets up are like the vital organs which maintain this organism. When an ideal is enslaved, the function of government departments supports it no longer; it is impaired or upset so far as this ideal is concerned, with the result that the ideal becomes diseased and emaciated. Its educational system, in the widest possible sense of the term, for example, which used to supply it with life-blood as the heart in an organism, is no longer its own. On the other hand it is used against it. When the enslaved ideal gets no nourishment, when it loses its freedom and consequently its capacity for recuperation and growth, the impulse for the ideal becomes weak while the impulse for the ruling ideal gains in strength in the same proportion. As a current of water stopped at one channel is compelled to seek another, so the obstructed love of self, which was once flowing towards the enslaved ideal, is compelled to seek an outlet in the ideal of rulers, which has by now begun to display its beauty, real or unreal, in various ways. Then the arguments in favour of the conquering ideal which lacked force and appeal formerly, begin to appear strong and convincing. The views and attitudes of the slaves (as judged, of course, by their actions and not merely by their words) undergo a change which they rarely know to be in the wrong direction or to be a departure from their own ideal. They "improve" in understanding and become more "reasonable" and more "civilised" from the point of view of the rulers as well as their own. Wise rulers exploit this period of unconscious change of views and ideas by administering to the slaves continuously

heavy doses of their own education which at last make them forget themselves completely. If ever they remember themselves again, it is like a man who has a faint recollection of a dream he had some years ago. Here and there a fortunate individual, whom circumstances have kept out of touch with the influences of the new ideal and in touch with those of the old ideal, is able to retain the love of the latter, to see the light of freedom himself and to call others to see it.

The Final Ideology will have to resort to much the same methods for its expansion. These methods, although natural to every ideal, are directly justified only in the case of the Right Ideal. When the Right Ideal conquers and ensalves a wrong ideal, it brings about the latter's inevitable disruption sooner than it would come otherwise. It creates circumstances which lead people actually to realize and experience the unreal character of its beauty. It adopts the most effective method of delivering people from the error of a wrong love. Not only does it cause the speedy frustration of a love that was doomed to frustration in any case but also substitutes it by a love which involves no painful disillusionments or disappointments for the future. It, therefore, renders a great service to the cause of evolution.

But the Right Ideology will win more on account of love than it will do on account of war. The love of man for man, which is a part of the urge of self, is able to have a perfectly free expression only in the case of a self-conscious man. We can really love human beings only if we love their Creator and in no other way. The Right Ideology will be a message of love and good-will to all, although it may not hesitate to resort to war whenever it is necessary to do so in order to clear the path of its love. A self-conscious man may hate a part of humanity but he will do so because he loves the whole of it and that to the fullest extent. He may fight and kill a part of humanity but he will do so in order that he may save the whole of it and that for ever. His activities, whether peaceful or warlike,

are rooted in his love of man and the Creator. They are always creative and constructive activities and they alone are conducive to the greatest good of the human race.

Both violence and non-violence as methods of opposing an ideal are consistent with the nature of consciousness and, therefore, with the nature of the Right Ideal. Each is essential for the expansion of an ideal. Each has its own natural, justified occasion and each supplements the other and prepares the ground for the success of the other. Neither can replace the other and, therefore, neither can be ruled out as wrong or unnecessary. Violence presupposes the existence of a certain amount of expansion and power already achieved by the ideal. It is, therefore, out of the question in the earliest stages of an ideal's development when the ideal is necessarily weak but, as the power of an ideal grows, a situation is soon created when non-violent methods can no longer help its expansion or existence and the ideal has to resort to violence for its freedom, life and growth. At this time the only other alternative to the use of violence is the slavery or the death of the ideal.

An ideal must expand because it is in the nature of life to press forward, to grow and evolve. The ideal of the self at every stage of the self's knowledge is the highest perfection and beauty known to it. The self makes an effort to establish a greater and greater contact with this perfection or beauty. It is this that leads to the expansion of the ideal. The self, whether social or individual, has no other aim in life except to serve the growth and expansion of its ideal and it serves it with the whole of its power and without a stop. All its activities are directed towards this purpose. The ideal expands a little and then uses the whole of its power so achieved for expanding and growing further. It insists on expanding as much as it is possible for it to expand by using the whole of its strength and not less than that. Naturally, therefore, as its power develops, the amount of expansion that it demands and that is possible for it to achieve, goes on increasing.

But an ideal can satisfy its ever increasing demands for expansion only at the expense of other ideals. Every ideal has not only to resist the expansion of other ideals at its own cost but also to expand itself at the cost of other ideals. Therefore every ideal-group, every social organism, like every individual organism in nature, develops an instrument of self-defence capable of destroying life and tries to make it as strong as it can. This instrument is the military power of the ideal-group. The offence or the attack of one ideal-group on another is invariably for the sake of self-defence because the ideal-group has not only to live but also to grow. In fact, like an organism, it can hope to maintain its life only if it is growing in some way. If it has ceased to grow, it is slowly advancing towards death. Life and growth are ultimately identical with each other. An ideal's urge for growth is a part of its urge to live. Whenever one ideal-group attacks another, it does so not because it is greedy or over-ambitious but because it appears to it that it cannot satisfy its needs as a living organism otherwise.

The growth or the expansion of the ideal continues uninterrupted for sometime, that is for, some time the resistance in the way of the ideal is such that it can be easily overcome by the normal, non-violent effort of the ideal and the ideal does not feel the necessity of putting up an extraordinary effort to crush it. But on account of its own expansion which another ideal must take as a menace to itself, or on account of the expansion of another ideal or on account of the expansion of both at the same time, a stage is reached sooner or later when its growth cannot continue further. It meets a strong resistance from another ideal. This is a critical time in the life of the ideal because it is now face to face with death. The ideal was expecting this moment and was partly prepared for it already. Now it musters the whole of its military might to overcome the resistance of the rival ideal for the sake of its very life. Consciousness cannot tolerate the least resistance to itself.

Nothing is immoral or vicious for consciousness except to tolerate resistance to itself in any form or shape. Morality of all standards has no other purpose nor meaning except that the ideal should not make a compromise with resistance at any price and it never makes a real compromise with it as long as it lives. The moment it makes a compromise with resistance, it is modified; in other words, it ceases to exist and makes room for another ideal. When, therefore, two ideals are face to face with each other in a conflict, each tries to make the attack as effective as possible so that each may be able to overcome the threat to its life as speedily and as surely as possible. *Hence naturally the clash takes a violent form.* Each ideal brings into action its military power, its life-destroying instrument of self-defence, which it had developed to serve it on such an occasion. As a result of it, one of the contending social organisms is wounded sufficiently to give up resistance to the other.

If, at this critical moment of its life, an ideal has scruples on the point of violence or blood-shed and if, on account of them, it waits, leaves things to chance or observes a policy of drift or non-violence, instead of actively opposing the resistance at all costs, it cannot hope to grow and live. Other ideals will grow at its expense and overpower it completely. But since the ideal is the greatest good and the highest beauty or perfection known to the self, it is the justified verdict of self that violence, if resorted to for the protection of the ideal, will be no sin. But violence does not mean killing all human beings whose ideal differs from our own. The self judges carefully whether the resistance to its purposes lies really in the lives of the individuals opposing it, and it has a recourse to violence rather than to a compromise with resistance, only when it becomes clear to it that it lies nowhere else. Destruction of life, barring that which may be the result of an insane mind, is never out of proportion with the needs of the ideal that is the cause of it; it is a different matter that it may be extremely foolish, indiscriminate and unproportionate from the point of view of

another ideal. To have an apparently different ideal or a different set of views is not the same thing as a readiness to offer resistance to another ideal. An ideal is aggressive and capable of offering resistance to another ideal only when it is really determining all the actions of a person, that is, when it is internally free.

The object of violence is not to kill every person who has a different ideal but to enslave the opposing ideal, to shatter its organisation, to paralyze its educational system and to snatch away its power in such a way that it is rendered harmless and incapable of interfering, under threat of violence or otherwise, with the independence and the expansion of your own ideal, or, if the complete enslavement of the rival ideal may not be compatible with the available strength or the immediate need of your ideal, then the object of violence is to weaken the rival ideal in such a way that it permits your ideal the expansion that it desires or requires for the time being.

We have already known that struggle with itself is the process by which life evolves. Life always meets resistance from itself and removes that resistance in order to pass on to a fuller realization of itself. The removal of its own resistance is not a sin but a virtue, the standard of which depends upon the standard of the ideal from which it results. In fact, this is the principal virtue, the central virtue, in every system of morality, high or low, and all other virtues are a part of it and are derived from it. The ideal is a part of the self; when one idea in an individual human being destroys another idea that competes with it, life is violent to and destroys a part of itself in order that the whole of it, as distinguished from a part, may dominate, which means, in order that it may achieve a fuller realization of itself. The idea that the individual allows to be defeated represents imperfect, incomplete life as compared with the idea that is allowed to win. Thus when life is violent to itself it does not really destory itself but rather builds itself, evolves itself and adds to its own life and strength.

Life is struggling with itself and outgrowing itself in the individual human being as well as in the human society as a whole. There is a close analogy between an individual and a group. The whole of humanity is like a single individual. The higher ideas are fighting with the lower ideas and the lower ideas are fighting with the higher ideas in the individual human being as well as in the vast group of human beings who live on this planet. As the struggle of the individual human being with himself results in his evolution, so the struggle of humanity with itself results in its evolution. The struggle, and consequently evolution, goes on continuously in the individual as well as in the human society as a whole. Violent bloody wars in which some ideals conquer and others fall are only critical and decisive moments in the struggle of humanity with itself. They are similar to the moments of tense anxiety in the consciousness of the individual human being when he is about to reach a great decision as a result of which some ideas will conquer and others will fall. The struggle of ideas in the consciousness of humanity as well as in the consciousness of the individual, however, continues at a slow pace before and after such critical and decisive moments.

The object of violence on the part of some ideas is not to kill human beings because of their beliefs but to weaken some other ideas, which become aggressive in the form of human beings and which, in this form, offer resistance to them; and they weaken these other ideas in order that they themselves may dominate. When one idea is weakened, another idea begins to dominate the consciousness in the same proportion in the case of the individual as well as in the case of the human society. Just as the struggle of the individual with himself is the struggle of one idea of his consciousness with other ideas, so the struggle of humanity with itself (that is the war of ideals) is essentially the struggle of one idea with other ideas in the consciousness of the human society as a whole. If there were no violence and no bloodshed, there would be no evolution of humanity as a whole

since the struggle of ideas in the consciousness of humanity would not come to a decision. In the case of the individual the Right Ideal cannot dominate the wrong ideas (which are always competing with it and pressing for supremacy) without a hard effort and struggle. It can defeat these ideas only in proportion to its effort or exertion and no more. It is this hard effort and struggle of the Right Ideal against the lower ideas which makes it so difficult for a man to lead a perfectly moral life. So in the case of human society as a whole the Right Ideal will not dominate the wrong ideas unless it struggles against them and defeats them and it will defeat them and dominate them only in proportion to its effort and no more. The domination of an idea in the case of the human individual as well as in the case of the human society is, of course, only in proportion to its freedom to determine action.

A violent conflict between two ideal-groups quickens the process of evolution in the consciousness of each human being in the two ideal-groups, in the consciousness of each ideal-group and in the consciousness of the human society as a whole.

The struggle of self with an outer danger to the ideal is really a reflection of its internal struggle with an internal danger to the ideal; it is a reflection of the struggle of the individual with himself. If there were no inner struggle, there would be no outer struggle. If the self does not play a coward in the outer struggle, it only means that it does not play a coward in the inner struggle. And when it acts cowardly in the outer struggle, it is an indication that it has lost the inner battle. The external struggle exists because of the internal struggle and it is difficult in proportion as the internal struggle is difficult. That is why a small ill-equipped army with a strong love for the ideal may often defeat a large well-equipped army with a weak love for the ideal. The efforts of the military authorities to keep up the 'morale' of a fighting army are really their efforts to enable it to win the internal struggle.

The violent opposition of an individual to his opponent in the battlefield is a minor part and a transitory phase of his major conflict with himself which goes on always in peace and in war but which becomes the hardest and, therefore, the most conducive to the evolution of self in war. When two armies are face to face with each other, the two ideas that they represent are expending the best of their power to overcome the resistance of contending ideas in the consciousness of each individual. The inner opposition to the idea is at the maximum and, therefore, the inner struggle of the individual is also at the maximum. The process of evolution in the consciousness of the individual as well as in the consciousness of humanity as a whole, is quickened to the utmost. The external struggle in each case has its foundation in the internal struggle. The individual self, as also the social self, displays the maximum of that passion for the ideal of which it is capable. This is, therefore, also the time when the ideal's capacity to attach the self's love to itself is put to a test. If the ideal is wrong, the self may soon reach the limit beyond which it cannot love the ideal. The ideal may suffer disruption on account of its own internal weaknesses, which become known to the self for the first time. This happens particularly when the ideal is defeated. But the disruption of the ideal is due fundamentally to the wrong elements that it contains and not to its defeat.

We have a horror of violence because, while on the one hand it involves a merciless destruction of human life, on the other hand it has been used ruthlessly in human history, in all but a few rare cases, from motives which were not very lofty or about the loftiness of which there has been no general agreement. This state of things has confused some moralists, who, not knowing how to stop violence or how to improve its motives or even what its motives really ought to be, have advocated non-violence, instead of violence, as a principle to be observed by every ideal, under all circumstances and at all costs. They indulge in a wholesale

condemnation of violence as if we can stop violence by mere words. Little do they know that the cure of violence is violence itself ! Violence can be stopped by meeting it and crushing it and, having once crushed it, by holding in readiness to crush it again, should it attempt to raise its head once more. It is an eternal law of nature that nature wants every organism high or low, social or individual, to prove its right to live by showing itself to be stronger than its opponent. Consciousness has a prejudice in favour of power because it is power itself.

Violence exists in the nature of life. It exists potentially in the ideal as a part of it or as a function within it, the object of which is the protection of the ideal. It is actualized as soon as the ideal meets sufficient resistance from another ideal. Actual violence must, therefore, continue as long as there is more than one ideal in the world and there will be more than one ideal in the world so long as the Right Ideal does not conquer all other ideals. Of course when the violence of one wrong ideal is crushed by another wrong ideal, the cure is temporary because every wrong ideal waits to be conquered by some other ideal. Violence will be crushed, *finally*, by the Right Ideal when it has overpowered all the wrong ideals. The strength that it will acquire as a result of this struggle will be its permanent achievement. It will be a *potential violence* ready to become actualized as soon as any wrong ideal shows signs of life again. It will be like the resistance of an extremely healthy and vigorous man against disease or infection. As the white blood cells throng the area of infection in the body of a man of vigorous health and remove the infection, so the disciplinary troops of the future world-state will rush to the area of rebellion (where some cells of the human social organism, that is, some human individuals, may have acquired the infection of wrong ideals) and will restore the health of the social individual of humanity. This attitude of *latent aggressiveness* on the part of a thoroughly contented, peaceful and righteous human social organism of the future

against itself, *i.e.*, against possible rebellions of wrong ideals within its body, will be similar to the *latent aggressiveness* and alertness of a thoroughly contented and righteous man against himself *i.e.*, against all possible evil ideas, slips, errors or temptations, originating in his own consciousness, to which he may become a victim. Righteousness or peace of mind (which means the unity or the wholeness of consciousness) is a gift of nature that has not only to be won by effort but also to be maintained by effort, in the case of the individual as well as in the case of the human society as a whole. The human race of the future will not be able to safeguard the peace it has once achieved, unless it maintains an attitude of *potential aggressiveness* against all possible factors calculated to shatter this peace.

The war of ideals has no other purpose in nature except that, as a result of this war, higher and higher ideals may begin to dominate more and more the lower ideals till finally the highest ideal may dominate all the lower ideals and efface them completely. If the highest and the last of ideals does not take part in the mutual war of ideals, assuming wrongly that violence at its own time is not a part of it, it will not be the highest and the last of them and another similar ideal with violence as a part of it must take its place, because it will not be able to bring to an end the process that nature started in the shape of the war of ideals. The active participation of the Right Ideal in the war of ideals will mark the last stages of the successful accomplishment of that process which nature started, no doubt, with a view to bringing it to a successful conclusion.

Violence cannot be immoral since it resides potentially in the nature of consciousness in order to become actual at the proper occasion, as the sting of a wasp or the electric organ of an electric catfish of the nematocysts of a hydra or the horns of an animal become active when necessary. Violence is right directly when it serves the Right Ideal. But even when it is wrong, being prompted by a wrong ideal, it serves a useful purpose of nature indirectly by clear-

ing the way for the domination of better and better ideals and finally for the domination of the best of all ideals. Unless violence runs its natural course, there can be no progress and no permanent peace on earth. Of all ideals, the Right Ideal alone has the capacity to obliterate all other ideals and, therefore, to dominate completely and permanently the consciousness of humanity. But it cannot do so unless it wins the war of ideals and it cannot win this war unless it enters it and fights it out to the end. Either other ideals will engage it in a war with themselves or, if it refuses to be thus engaged, they will not permit it to achieve its independence and to grow and expand at their cost and thus to fulfil its great mission in nature. It will thus cease to be the Final Ideal and the Right Ideal. If it takes up the challenge of other ideals, whether implied or explicit, boldly, and it cannot but take it up by its very nature as the Right Ideal, it will acquire the health and the strength that will be necessary for its life and growth. It is by struggling that it will satisfy the necessary conditions of its existence. The life and growth of the Last Ideal cannot but be governed by those very laws of nature which govern the life and growth of every other ideal. These laws are universal and infallible like the laws of Biology. The Final Ideal will, therefore, have to struggle for its life in the same way in which all other ideals have to struggle.

If we substitute non-violence for violence completely throughout the world at the present stage of human evolution *while the ideals remain the same* (supposing it is possible for us to persuade humanity to do anything against their nature on a large scale), we shall only delay and prolong the war of ideals instead of bringing it to a quick decision. The struggle of ideals will not cease; it will only slow down as a process. The unity that will be established in this way will be apparent and superficial and not the genuine real harmony which the victory of the Right Ideal alone will bring about. It will not be a unity at all; it will be, at the best, a truce or a suspension of hostilities which will, how-

ever, continue to lie dormant. We shall involve the vast human social individual of this earth in a mental state which will be similar to the mental state of a man who has many ideas existing side by side in his mind but who does not know what ideas to choose and what to reject. The indecision of such a man results in his inactivity and, therefore, in the absence of his progress. Thus we shall bring the process of human evolution to a stop, or, at least, retard it considerably. We shall deprive ourselves, at the same time, of that special progress, mental and moral which can result only from a hard and strenuous effort, such as only opposition and resistance can induce. The Final Ideology cannot appear, cannot win and cannot fulfil its great mission in nature after winning, unless that knowledge and progress which come to us not only as a result of peace but also as a result of war, grow from stage to stage. Our knowledge of beauty becomes real and practical and capable of determining action when it is allowed to determine action, that is, when, urged by this knowledge, we meet resistance and overcome it and in no other way. Thus, by substituting non-violence for violence, while mankind continues to love wrong ideals, we shall do no real service to the human society and shall only put off the day when they will be able to achieve their real unity and harmony. *There is only one road leading to world-peace and that is the road leading to a universal acceptance of the Right Ideal.*

The active participation of the Right Ideology in the war of ideals, resulting in the domination of one idea over all the other ideas, will be the struggle of the consciousness of humanity *with itself* for the achievement of its own oneness or wholeness. It will be similar to the struggle of the consciousness of the human individual *with itself* for the achievement of its oneness or wholeness through the victory of one idea over all the other ideas. The idea that can dominate and unify the consciousness of the human individual as well as the consciousness of the human society, finally and completely must be, on account of the very

nature of consciousness, the Right Ideal. The perfect unity or wholeness of consciousness is possible only at the highest stage of self-consciousness, in the case of the individual as well as in the case of the society. The oneness of the human race cannot be achieved unless we destroy all the wrong ideals swaying mankind at present and thus unify the consciousness of humanity. And when we succeed in achieving the oneness or the wholeness of humanity at last, it will not be maintained and carried to a higher and higher perfection unless we constantly keep in check and hold in readiness to destroy all those ideas which tend to shatter it. In other words, we shall have to maintain a continuous struggle in order to achieve our unity as well as to preserve it and to bring it to a greater and greater perfection always.

Oneness is a quality of consciousness and, like all the other qualities of consciousness, its expression or realization is becoming more and more perfect and pronounced in the process of evolution. Consciousness has been struggling with obstacles in order to express itself, its qualities, ever more and more perfectly in creation. Perfection of oneness will be achieved, therefore, through a process of struggle and opposition to resistance.

The oneness or the wholeness of the atom, the higher oneness of the living cell, the still higher oneness of the living organism and the next higher oneness of the consciousness of the human individual or the unity of the human personality, wherever it exists, has been each the result of struggle on the part of consciousness. Each has been acquired as a result of struggle and is being maintained as a result of it. The next higher oneness, which is the oneness of the conciousness of the human society as a whole, will be also the result of a process of struggle in which victory—a hard-won and well-deserved victory—will lie with consciousness, that is, with the Right Ideology, through which indeed consciousness will become a direct and conscious participant in the struggle. Consciousness has been fighting its way to a more and more perfect oneness or whole-

ness in the past and it must continue to fight its way to a more and more perfect oneness or wholeness in the future. A continuous opposition to obstacles, a constant destruction or resistance, whatever the form in which it may present itself, is an essential condition of the continuous advancement of the human race towards an ever greater and greater perfection of their unity.

The process of the growth of oneness by means of struggle can never come to a stop unless the universe achieves its perfection and ceases to evolve and, therefore, to exist. However perfect the wholeness or the oneness that the human race may have achieved at any time, there will be, so long as the world does not reach its perfection, always, a higher and a more perfect oneness or wholeness to be achieved. The struggle will, therefore, continue for ever. Struggle will be necessary not only to achieve a oneness or wholeness but also to maintain it and to achieve the next more perfect oneness or wholeness. To put the same thing in a more concrete way, struggle will not only bring about the unity of the human race by establishing a government or a state of the Right Ideal throughout the world but will also enable that state to preserve its hard-won unity as well as to go on adding to it indefinitely. *The unity of the future world-state of the Right Ideal will continue to develop because the self-consciousness of its members,* i.e., *their love for the Right Ideal, will go on increasing on account of their continuous worship and adoration of this ideal as well as their constant action and struggle in its service.* As they will increase their love for the Right Ideal, they will also increase their love for each other in the same proportion and hence the unity of the human race will continue to become more and more perfect. A perfect unity of consciousness is possible only at the highest stage of self-consciousness, in the case of the individual as well as in the case of the society, and the self-consciousness of the society grows with the growth of the self-consciousness of the individual. As in the case of the consciousness of the

human individual, so in the case of consciousness of the human society, struggle will conquer resistance; it will hold in check the resistance that is already conquered and it will conquer fresh resistance and thus evolution will go on.

It may look like a self-contradicting statement but it is, all the same, a fact that the path of love lies through the valley of hatred. We can love an object or an idea only by loving it and hating its antithesis simultaneously. Every man loves and hates at the same time. When a man is conscious of loving, his hatred is implied and unconscious. When he is conscious of hating, his love is implied and unconscious. Love involving creativeness and hatred involving destructiveness are thus like the two sides of the same coin. They co-operate with each other for the evolution of consciousness. Neither of the two can function fully and freely without the other.

It is highly important for understanding the nature of consciousness to realize that every quality of consciousness implies and includes all its other qualities. When we desire to express one quality of consciousness, it is with the expressed or implied, conscious or unconscious, immediate or ultimate support of all its other qualities that we can do so. To the extent to which we may be unable to get such a support from any one of these other qualities of consciousness, to that extent we shall be unable to express the quality that we desire to express. No quality of consciousness is worthy of itself if it is divorced from any one of its other qualities. Each quality of consciousness is the whole consciousness or it is not that quality at all. Consciousness is a whole and must act as a whole. None of its qualities can be eliminated from it. No one of its qualities is useless or immoral now and no one of them will be useless and immoral in the future. The nature of consciousness is permanent and unalterable. All the qualities of consciousness are good and moral because they are expressed in the service of love. They are aspects or forms of love. They are the different ways in which love needs to express itself

at different occasions in order to reach its own completeness. A person who is pledged to the love of an idea but not to the hatred and the consequent destruction of objects or ideas that represent its antithesis, is really pledged to neither of the two or pledged to both. A person who is not prepared to clear the path of love or to fight for it when necessary, pays only a lip service to the object of his love. His love (whether he knows it or not) is worse than indifference. He is deceiving himself as well as others that he is a lover.

A sense of readiness to destroy all opposition to love will be necessary for the completeness of love and will persist for ever. Since it will enable consciousness to hold in check the resistance that it has already conquered, it will enable it to meet and conquer fresh resistance and thereby to continue its evolution. It will be an essential condition of the preservation of the past victories of consciousness as well as an indispensable foundation of its efforts for the achievement of fresh victories. When there will be nothing to hate in this world, love, divine as well as human, will reach its highest possible realization. It will achieve its final victory, after which it can wish for nothing more. At this stage the Universe will reach its perfection. In other words, it will be impossible for it to evolve itself further and, since the conscious activity of the World-Self in the Universe, which we have known to be the cause of evolution, will come to a stop at this time, the Universe will disappear and make room for the birth of a new one It only means that hatred, like all the other qualities of consciousness, must continue to serve love as long as the world lasts.

Struggle, opposition to resistance of one kind or another, will remain, by the very nature of consciousness, an essential condition of evolution till the end of the world.

Bloodshed, caused by the mutual wars of wrong ideals, is extremely deplorable, since it is not even a direct or consciously rendered aid to evolution. But it is going on in accordance with definite laws of nature and there is no refuge

from it except in the laws of nature itself. There is only one way in which the human race can save itself from needless bloodshed and that is by adopting the Right Ideal, universally, and by loving it ever more and more. This is what they are going to do, sooner or later, and the sooner they do it the better.

We evolve by giving a greater and greater expression to our nature and an aspect of our nature is to live in the form of organised and independent societies or self-governing states. It follows that the idea of a self-ruling state is inseparable from the Right Ideal and that *the forces of evolution are tending towards the creation of a self-ruling state founded on the Right Ideal, which will struggle and expand, gradually but inevitably, to the whole world.*

The nature of self is such that it can realize every ideal, whether right or wrong, only in society. Bergson writes:—

"On the two great routes that the vital impulse has found open before it along the series of the arthropods and the series of the vertebrates instinct and intelligence, at first wrapped up confusedly with one another, have, in their development, taken divergent directions. At the culminating point of the first evolution hymenoptera, at the culminating point of the second man. In each in spite of the radical difference in the forms attained and the growing separation of the paths followed it is to social life that evolution leads as though the need of it was felt from the very beginning or rather as though there was some original and essential aspiration of life which could find full satisfaction only in society. Society which is the community of individual energies benefits from the efforts of all its members and renders effort easier to all. It can only subsist by subordinating the individual, it can only progress by leaving the individual free, *contradictory requirements which have to be reconciled.* With insects the first condition alone is fulfilled. The societies of ants and bees are admirably disciplined and united but fixed in an invariable routine. If the individual is forgotten in the society

the society on its part also has forgotten its destination. Individual and society both in a state of somnambulism, go round and round in the same circle instead of moving straight forward to a greater social efficiency and complete individual freedom. Human societies alone have kept full in view both the ends to be attained".

Bergson rightly believes that the gradual progress and evolution of society will consist in the gradual reconciliation of the contradictory requirements of leaving the individual free and subordinating him to the interests of the society. But the check on the individual's freedom which the society must need impose on him can be consistent with his freedom only if it is demanded by the ideal of his nature. Only that society, therefore, will be directly helping evolution which is founded on the Right Ideal. In such a society alone the opposite requirements of the freedom and subordination of the individual will cease to be opposite and will on the other hand support each other. Such a society must ultimately take the form of a government which is both a democracy and a dictatorship at one and the same time.

A dictatorship is the most efficient form of social organization in which the individual may lose himself for the common good of all. In a dictatorship alone the indivudual can be disciplined and subordinated completely to the requirements of the group. Hence, it is only in this form of society which is, by the way, the latest term in the evolution of social organizations, that the Right Ideal can be expected to reach and will actually reach its highest possible realization. The group of men who come to be inspired by the Right Ideal in future will favour this type of society in view of its efficiency and strength to cope with dangers inside and outside the group, which will be grave and numerous in the beginning. Because they will expect a career of hard struggle, they will, out of a necessity, resort to a form of government which qualifies them most of all for this struggle by giving them the greatest possible efficiency and strength as a group. Having established a

dictatorship to meet their urgent initial necessities, they will discover that it is a form of government which not only gives them a good start but which, by assuring a complete unity and discipline among the group, also supplies the individual and the society with facilities for effort and action which are valuable under all circumstances. The coming ideology will thus incarnate itself into the form of a highly organized dictatorship of self-conscious individuals working collectively with an ever-increasing unity of purpose towards individual and social freedom, progress and power and attain to a self-imposed discipline as perfect as that of bees and ants.

In such a society alone the urge of consciousness to achieve its oneness or wholeness in a large group, including ultimately the whole of humanity, will be able to attain to its highest satisfaction, because such a society alone can be disciplined and organized sufficiently to be able to function as a single organism or a single individual, which is what the nature of consciousness demands. The dictator of such a society will be a man who, by virtue of his high stage of self-consciousness, will be fitted to be a true representative of Consciousness, which is the real and the ultimate dictator of the human society. Every individual in such a state will obey the urge of consciousness in him interpretted by their human leader or dictator to the best of his knowledge of self with the help of a party of highly self-conscious men.

The restrictions and limitations, which a society of this kind will have to impose on the individual for its own maintenance and expansion, will be not only in accordance with the deepest nature of the individual but also a source of help to him to expand and unfold the possibilities of that nature. But as the self-consciousness of the individual and the society will grow, it will become less and less necessary for them to be ruled by a government although indeed it will take a long time before the government becomes entirely unnecessary.

Lenin and Kropotkin dreamt of an ultimate class-less

society functiong without a dictator or a government throughout the world. But even when a perfect economic freedom or equality has been reached throughout the world and the so-called classes have ceased to exist, differences among men will continue to be created by the different ways in which they will satisfy their urge of self. No lasting sense of a unity of desires and purposes can be created in men unless they all have an ideal of a permanent and stable character, which means an ideal that meets all the demands of their nature. The communists, can, therefore, never see the light of that day when it will be possible for them to dispense with a government. On the other hand, when the Right Ideal has established itself thoroughly in the hearts of all men throughout the world, they may not require a human dictator at all. Then the dictator of every person will be solely his Creator and every person will be able to look within and take orders from Him for everything.

It is not hunger or the urge of instincts that will be able to control the urge of self but it will be rather the urge of self that will control the urge of instincts and deliver mankind from mutual hatred and discord—such is our nature.

In the case of a dictatorship based on the Right Ideal the discipline imposed on the individual by the society will not interfere with his freedom but will rather enable him to give a fuller expression to his nature and to acquire a greater and greater freedom of his self. There will be ultimately a perfect harmony between the commands of the dictator and the most cherished and freely chosen desires of the ordinary members of the state. In such a state the individual will be free for himself from himself. It will protect him from his own weaknesses and will assure his progress and freedom. Freedom never means absolute freedom. We are always bound by the laws of our ideals and we are free only when we are under no restraint internal or external to abide by those laws. The restraint is internal when our weaknesses, due to our instinctive inclinations, stand in the way of our ideal. It is apparently external (although really

internal) when an outside power stands in the way of our ideal. The individual is a slave in both cases. In a dictatorship of the Right Ideal the external powers must naturally protect the individual's efforts to achieve the ideal from his internal weaknesses. Thus in such a dictatorship we shall be free from all kinds of slavery internal as well as external.

But while an efficient and strict government like a dictatorship is extremely useful in the service of the Right Ideal, it is extremely harmful in the service of a wrong one. A dictatorship is a blessing when its ideal is the Right Ideal because, in such a case, it can protect the individual most strictly and efficiently from himself for himself; it gives him a greater and greater freedom to unfold his deepest nature; it facilitates his effort to give more and more expression to the urge of his self. But it is equally a curse if the ideal of the state is one of the wrong ideals because then it is able to obstruct the urge of self most strictly and efficiently, it bars the individual from himself against himself with all the efficiency characteristic of it. Then not only does it subject the individual to a slavery but also makes it most difficult for him to shatter the chains of that slavery. Then it should be regarded of all forms of government, the worst and the most wicked as also the most injurious to the evolution of humanity.

But although the social organization of the Right Ideal will begin as a dictatorship, it will evolve and improve with the evolving self-consciousness of the individual and soon take the form of a social organization which will be at once a most perfect dictatorship as well as a most perfect democracy, free from all the defects of democracy now known to be unavoidable. The reason is that it will be founded on a clearly defined intellectual or scientific ideology which, as time will pass, will be understood more and more clearly and loved more and more intensely by all the individuals in the state. A government based on such an ideology must soon become a real government of all the people by all the

people and for all the people. The dictator of such a state will be a dictator only in name. He will be really a servant of the people. Having to follow strictly an ideology, the needs and requirements of which are known and understood thoroughly and in details by all the people in the state, it will not be possible for him to violate these needs and requirements and thereby to go against the general will of his subjects by means of any of his orders or decisions. Thus *the scientific nature of the ideology will be a guarantee that the dictator will never be able to misuse his powers with impunity.*

Such a state will be the culminating point of the evolution of both democracy and dictatorship. It will be like a bee-hive. No one can tell whether the society in a bee-hive is a dictatorship or a democracy, whether the individual bees working day and night dutifully for the common good of the community, of which they are the members, obey the orders of the queen or follow their own cherished wills. Since no member of the group can do any thing contrary to the will of the leader and has to obey the leader implicitly and unreservedly, it is a dictatorship and, since each of its acts is completely in accord with the will of all in the community, it is a perfect "government of the people by the people for the people", that is to say, a perfect democracy. This becomes possible because, what the leader wills is exactly the will of each member of the hive. Every individual bee in a hive acts rightly (*i.e.*, consistently with the needs of the group as a whole) in its social life but its actions are instinctive, automatic and unconscious. At the highest stage of human evolution the highly self-conscious human individual will act rightly and consistently with the requirements of the society as a whole, not instinctively and automatically like a bee, but by a conscious and deliberate choice and it will be as difficult for him to mistake the path dictated to him by his love and illuminated for him by his own intellect and intelligence, as it is for a bee to mistake the path

chalked out for it by its inflexible instincts. Thus the activities of the future man will result from the orders of his human dictator as well as from his own most cherished desires simultaneously and no one will know what their real source is.

There is nothing to choose between external and internal slavery. The external slavery is bad because it stands in the way of our love, our ideal and the internal slavery does the same. The external slavery resolves itself ultimately into internal slavery. Our draw-backs are ultimately internal and not external. External impediments are in one sense rather a blessing because they call forth effort and enable us to make progress. When we fail to make an effort to remove the impediments, it is because of our internal weaknesses, our inability to sacrifice our instinctive desires for the sake of our ideals. We become slaves only when we accept internal slavery and we become externally free only when we are internally free. Internal freedom is incompatible with external slavery, that is, a man free from the desires of his lower nature never submits to a master other than his own ideal. To have an ideal is to accept a ruler. No person internally free can be ruled by the representative of an ideal not his own.

When we have a wrong ideal, we are unable to express our nature; we are slaves although our slavery is of our own choice made erroneously.

When the subjects have the same ideal as the rulers, they are said to be free; when their ideal is different, they are said to be slaves. In the former case, the ideal, whether it is wrong or right, is free to realize itself to any extent, as the rulers will give the individual the freedom and the facility that he needs. In the latter case the slaves have only two courses open to them. They may continue to make efforts such as they can with their limited means and reduced power, to get freedom or they may abandon their efforts altogether. If they keep up their efforts to win freedom, their ideal is alive and they may triumph one day.

If they give them up, they become a part and parcel of the ruling ideal-group and their ideal disappears. If the ruling group exploits them instead of giving them a share in the government, it is because their exploitation forms a part of the ideal to which the slaves have subscribed willingly.

We must distinguish between real and apparent freedom. Every ideal imposes its own rules and restrictions. Every body has an ideal and, therefore, every body is bound by the rules and restrictions imposed by his ideal. Freedom never means the absence of restrictions. It means freedom to seek an ideal, willingly accepting all the restrictions that are imposed by the ideal. When we use the word freedom, therefore, we need to qualify it by specifying the purpose or the ideal for which it is to be used. The self is really free only when it is seeking the Right Ideal, otherwise it is a slave to desires and laws which are not its own. Our freedom is only apparent when we are free to seek a wrong ideal; really it is slavery. But whether the restrictions are of our own choice or imposed from outside, they will impair our freedom only if they are contrary to our nature.

Whether a man is a subject or a ruler, he is a slave, if he has a wrong ideal. If he is a ruler, his freedom is apparent and his slavery is real, although it is of his own choice. There can be five different types of society from the point of view of the ideals of the rulers and the ruled.

The Ideal of Rulers.	*The Ideal of the Individual Subject.*	*Result for the Individual Subject.*
I. Wrong	Wrong and different.	Slavery in appearance and in reality.
II. Wrong	Wrong and same	Freedom in appearance and slavery in reality.
III. Right	Wrong	Slavery in appearance and in reality. (Tends to change into real freedom).

The Ideal of Rulers.	*The Ideal of the Individual Subject.*	*Result for the Individual Subject.*
IV. Wrong	Right	Slavery in appearance and slavery in reality. (Tends to change either into the 5th or the 2nd type.)
V. Right	Right	Real freedom leading to the greatest progress of man.

An example of the first type is India of prepartition days, when the ideal of the subjects was Indian Nationalism and the ideal of the rulers was British Imperialism, both wrong ideals. Although the British have left that country, real freedom will not come to the peoples of India so long as they do not base their constitution on the Right Ideal. Examples of the second type are Russia, France, Turkey and many other so-called "free" countries of the world. The fifth type is the objective of evolution. The fourth type is the earlier stage of the fifth type. The third type will exist side by side with the fifth type for sometime and ultimately disappear enabling the fifth type to dominate. That the fourth type of society may have one of the two opposite results for the individual, either real freedom or real slavery, is due to the fact that self-consciousness and slavery are terms incompatible with each other. A group of self-conscious men living under the government of a wrong ideal must either accept slavery and lose their self-consciousness or must continue to make efforts to get independence, in which case they must ultimately succeed. Self-conscious men, as long as they remain self-conscious, have their own law to follow and their own ruler to obey and that ruler is the Right Ideal. Their ideal must dominate all their activities, whether they are called private or public activities, because it creates a distinction between

right and wrong which extends to the whole life of the individual.

All our activities are governed by our ideal. It is, therefore, meaningless to divide human activities into two parts, public and private. Because our ideal is always a social ideal, because it is derived from the society and is also the common ideal of a society of individuals, all our activities have a social reference, whether or not they appear to us to have been directly influenced and required by the society. The private and personal life of a man, as an individual, and his social and political life, as a member of a society or a state, cannot be strictly distinguished. Every part of our life, whether it is social, political, moral, religious, intellectual, personal or private, forms a link of a single chain and belongs to an indivisible unity, since every part of it is determined by the single force of the ideal.

The devotees of Nationalism or Socialism, who insist that religion is a private concern of the individual and that it should have nothing to do with Politics, in fact deny the position of religion as an ideal of life.

A person who is really seeking the Right Ideal will derive from that ideal alone the canons and principles that will guide him not only in his private affairs like his dealings with his friends and relatives, marriage, the choice of a profession, etc., but also in those actions which he is called upon to perform jointly and simultaneously with other individuals, actions which are determined by the policy of the rulers in matters of finance, commerce, education, the procedure of courts, international relations, civil and constitutional law, military action, etc. His ideal will, therefore, come into a clash with the ideal of the rulers at many points. If he co-operates with the ruling wrong ideal, he will be not only doing himself but also collaborating with the rulers in forcing others to do many things which are contrary to the demands of the Right Ideal. Moreover, the state will bring to bear on a great portion of his life, a pressure which cannot fail to influence the rest of it, even

that portion of it which he considers as private. His own public life as well as the public life of other persons around him must influence his private life also to some extent. The influence of the wrong ideal of the rulers will pervade the whole of his life, only affecting some portions of it more visibly than others.

Life is a single whole. Any force that influences a part of it must influence the whole of it in the long run. Every action that we perform influences every other action of our life more or less for better or for worse. But even if a man thinks that he is able to protect a portion of his life, that which he considers as the private and personal portion of it, entirely from the influence of the dominating wrong ideal, a portion of his life, that which he calls national or international, will continue to be directly influenced by it. But no servant can act under the commands of two masters at once. You cannot have one ideal for your private life and another ideal for your public or national life. No two ideals can flourish side by side with each other in the same mind. No idea can be said to be in the process of realization if it is weighed down by the political power of another ideal. You cannot have a portion of your life—the personal and private portion of it—controlled by the Right Ideal and another portion—the public portion of it—controlled by the wrong ideal which happens to have established its rule, especially when you are compelled to do so by force.

Self-consciousness must grow or decline. It must progress or regress. No progress in self-consciousness is possible unless a man conforms strictly to the discipline imposed by the Right Ideal. If there is any resistance in his way he must at once apply himself to overcome it. If he yields to the slightest of resistance willingly, the progress of his self-consciousness is doomed. To shatter all resistance is the imperative demand of the ideal and an indispensable condition of the evolution of self. To attack resistance is to progress. A self-conscious man feels impelled to break all resistance in his way and he must succeed in break-

ing it ultimately because his efforts to break it are favourable to the aspirations of Consciousness. If he puts up with the resistance to his ideal and accepts slavery, he degenerates or at least stagnates. Being faced with the necessity of obeying two ideals, one his own, the Right Ideal, and the other that of the rulers, a wrong ideal, he makes, consciously or unconsciously, a compromise between them retaining that portion of the Right Ideal which can fit into the wrong ideal easily and which does not require any effort or any opposition to resistance in order to be followed. He thus invents a new modified ideal which is not right but wrong. His idea of beauty is altered. He loves ugliness instead of beauty. Such a slave consoles himself that he is a peace-loving, peaceful and law abiding citizen, realizing little that he is neglecting his own law and no longer abiding by it. What he would have loved or liked in a state of freedom, he hates and dislikes in the state of slavery and *vice versa*. What is really ugly appears beautiful to him. His moral judgments become marred by the influence of the wrong ideal followed by the rulers which he has himself partially accepted. He, therefore, develops a philosophy to defend and justify his new ideal which is really a combination of right and wrong.

The ideal is a call for action. It impels the self to change the actual conditions in the world to suit itself and its ideal. If a self-conscious man does not oppose the resistance of the ruling wrong ideal with the maximum of his power, which is, of course, always a harmonious combination of courage, prudence, planning, co-operation and discipline, he has given himself up to a wrong ideal, has reconciled himself to slavery and has sacrificed the growth of his self-consciousness. A person who reconciles himself to slavery must be doing so because of his desire to preserve his life, position, riches or property. These are instinctive desires the love of which must be stronger in his heart than the love of the ideal. His ideal has lost an inner battle and every battle lost by the Right Ideal is a

battle won by a wrong ideal, which in this way gains in power and force at the expense of the Right Ideal. His ideal is changing more and more to his instinctive desires. Since the self could not rise to the level of the Right Ideal on account of its inability to cope with the barriers presented by the instinctive desires, so it is forced to lower the ideal to its own low level. Since the self could not act in accordance with its belief or its idea of beauty, it is compelled to believe in accordance with what it likes to do. Its idea of beauty has changed. The slave's attitude towards life is altered. His ideal loses its beauty. He becomes a slave in appearance and in reality.

Slavery is one of the greatest misfortunes that can befall an individual. It becomes a huge impediment in the way of his continued self-realization. The slave uses his own powers but realizes the ideals of others. He works for his enemies and gets nothing but bread in return for his labour. He buys his physical existence at the cost of his consciousness. What a losing bargain! Yet the slave is rarely conscious of his loss. He considers it a favour that he is allowed to live on. Creative activity of the highest order, whether it pertains to art or science or philosophy, can be rarely expected of a slave. As long as nations remain free, they invent and create and add to the knowledge of the world but as soon as they become slaves, their creativeness is doomed. The urge of self can find an adequate expression only in conditions of perfect freedom. Many a nation, which made astonishing contributions to human knowledge in the past when it was free, is incapable of adding anything to the achievements of its ancestors now that it is slave. The world, unable to explain it, wonders at the death of a talent, once so brilliant, which peace and education fail to revive. Unfortunately for the slaves the killing effect of slavery is very imperceptible and it is very rare that a slave is able to realize it.

We are happy when the urge of self is having a full expression. There are two ways in which it can be

achieved; by making a successful effort for the ideal or, if the effort required by the ideal is difficult, as when a man is the slave of a strong master, by lowering the ideal to the level of that effort which is easily possible. The ideal compels and goads the self to strive for its achievement. It is relentlessly persistent in its demands and does not stop to consider whether the effort that it demands of the self is safely possible or not, as long as there is the slightest chance of its success in the near or the distant future. It insists on the effort no matter whether the individual lives or dies as a result of it. When the effort is difficult, as it certainly is in conditions of slavery, the self can have no rest and no peace unless it either prepares itself to obey the ideal and face boldly the dangers involved in the effort or else brings down the ideal in the scale of beauty. In such a way the effort that was difficult becomes unnecessary and unimportant. When the self cannot raise its effort to suit the ideal, it lowers the ideal to suit the effort because it is impossible for it to take a position midway between these two alternatives.

Whenever the self rejects the first alternative and adopts the second one, it does so quite unknowingly; it does not know that it has lowered or changed the ideal. The self says to itself, "My ideal does not really require this effort but that one." But although the self does not say it in so many words and does not admit it consciously, it amounts to saying, "It is not this ideal that is beautiful but that ideal". The belief or the ideal of the self has changed. At this moment, in order to facilitate its own deception, which it needs so badly, the self invents a philosophy and even a religion based on "divine authority" in support of its new indispensable belief, knowing little that its philosophy or religion is the outcome of a necessity and has no worth or value of its own. A slave is able to justify his slavery by means of nice, hair-splitting arguments. No arguments can convince a slave who has reconciled himself to slavery that he is a slave. He resists such a conviction because the moment he has it an impossible situation will be created.

He will at once see the beauty of an ideal that will strongly impel him to an effort of which he is incapable. He reconciled himself to slavery just because he was incapable of this effort. And now he has become still more incapable of it because, as a result of his slavery, he has already lost not only his conviction but also his courage and hope. One must know that a verbal confession of slavery is not the same thing as a conviction of slavery. A real conviction mus induce action calculated to break the chains of slavery. A contented slave, whether he knows it or not, has turned himself away from his own ideal. He has refused to face it or to see its beauty and the ideal has practically lost its beauty for him. We can feel only that much of the beauty of an ideal for which we are ready to make an effort; the rest of its beauty we refuse to acknowledge.

The pleasure derived from the use of soporifics and intoxicants is due to the fact that for the time the individual is under the influence of such drugs the self forgets its ideal which is forcing it to exert itself to the utmost always. The self is enabled to lower the ideal to the level of instinctive desires and to give an easy expression to the urge of self in this way. The philosophy or the religion which a slave invents for himself serves him a similar purpose; it acts on him as a narcotic or an intoxicant and enables him to forget his troublesome ideal, his hard task master, for sometime.

Dissatisfaction with all existing ideals is essential before a person can see the Beauty of the Right Ideal. We proceed from the rejection of one ideal to the affirmation of another. The series of World Wars seems to be creating this kind of dissatisfaction at persent. The shortcomings and the undesirable or unsatisfactory elements of the existing wrong ideals are becoming more and more visible and there seems to be growing in Europe and every where in the world a strong desire for a new and a better ideology.

When the Perfect Ideology is at last able to win its freedom and obtain political power somewhere in the world, it will have to reclaim a considerable section of the

population ruled by it from the baneful influence of wrong ideals by means of education through press, platform, radio, cinema and school. Education is an instrument which can be used equally for better or for worse. Every system of education is adapted to the ideal that creates it. If education is adapted to the Right Ideal, it will lead the individual to his freedom; if to the wrong one, it will make a slave of him, although it will, no doubt, also make him feel completely reconciled to his slavery.

A state founded on the Right Ideal will have to ban upto a reasonable extent the expression of all opinion that is antagonistic to the Right Ideal. It will be essential in the interest of the freedom of the individual who will have to be protected from the influence of wrong ideals. Intolerance is not bad if we know its use. It supplements education and protects its benefits. There is no use injecting a poison into the system depending upon the efficacy of an antidote. If cure is essential, there is no reason why prevention should not be equally essential. We can bother about intolerance as repressive of the individual's freedom only so long as we do not know, for certain, in what does the individual's welfare consist. When the knowledge of the highest good becomes the common property of all, as it must ultimately, we shall not mind being hard to the individual in his own interest as well as in the interest of the society of which he is a member. We know to-day the rules of health definitely and certainly and the result is that we enforce them at the point of sword in the interest of public health. A man who commits a nuisance on a public road is at once sent to prison and no one is astonished at the penalty. A day is coming in the progress of our civilization and culture when we shall understand the rules conducive to the health or the happiness of the self as surely and as commonly as we know to-day the rules of bodily health. Then may the people laugh at a man, who delivers a speech in a public gathering in favour of Dialectical Materialism or National Imperialism

and no one will wonder at his going to prison.

Let us consider some of the political ideologies that prevail in the world to-day and compare them with the Ideology of the Future. The ideal that has had the greatest hold on the peoples of Europe since the downfall of Christianity is Nationalism. Marxism only recently overthrew it in a part of Europe, with the result that in order to strengthen itself further and protect itself against Marxism, it assumed its most extreme form in Fascism and Naziism.

The material progress that Europe was able to achieve owing to the National ideal made it the most fascinating idea throughout the world, even in the backward countries of the East. Like every wrong ideal, Nationalism has some good points in it. It brings about a unity of purpose, a spirit of co-operation, self-discipline and self-scarifice for the sake of a limited, mainly material, welfare among a limited section of humanity. The ideal neglects a considerable portion of our higher needs and lacks the universality of the Right Ideal. It was, for these reasons, destined to bring about its own ruin and it is bringing it about speedily. Since each national ideal is founded on the adoration of a particular strip of territory bounded by definite geographical limits and inhabited mostly by a particular race, it creates a dangerous permanent hatred among the national group against the rest of mankind. This hatred, generally camouflaged in attractive philosophies and sweet words and skilful propaganda, is the cause of international wars. Plato had taught mankind the great truth that Politics could not be separated from Ethics if it was to serve the interests of peace, order and good government. But the ideal of the National State left no room for Ethics and, therefore, religion was separated from Politics as a matter of necessity. Although European politicians ever paid lip service to freedom, justice and morality, yet, since they had adopted the ideal of Machiavelli, the state, they could not escape the necessity of following its law, which according to Machia-

velli (and Machiavelli was perfectly right in concluding it from his ideal) justified every cruelty and treachery provided it could further the interests of the state. The national ideal, like every other ideal, has its own moral law. Europe, having submitted to this law, could not escape its evil consequences which have appeared so far in the shape of two World Wars, the bloodiest in the history of mankind.

Right ethical behaviour of the individuals as well as of the states can result only from the Right Ideal. *It is impossible for any state to combine Ethics with Politics as Plato desired, unless it adopts the Right Ideal.* Plato himself was ignorant of this fact and that is why his carefully instructed Prince of Syracuse failed to develop into a philospher King. Plato did not know that we act in obedience to our impluses and not in obedience to reason. A strongly developed love for the Right Ideal alone can assure a moral behaviour on the part of a ruler. We act rightly when the right impulse in us is strengthened in such a way as to be able to dominate all other impulses. Actions which have their source in the love the Right Ideal alone are actions of unmixed morality. We cannot really love our fellowmen irrespective of their caste, creed or religion unless, we love their Creator.

Some of us in the East, who are zealous imitators of Europe, think that the consequences of Nationalism from which Europe has suffered and is suffering are not inevitable and that a nation can be good to a neighbouring people, have an altruistic and a universal outlook and at the same time mind its own national interests adequately. This is a profound mistake! Every ideal-group has certain definite tendencies of behaviour inherent in the nature of its ideal which must operate and goad it to act in a definite direction as surely as a tree bears its own fruit. The behaviour of a national state is determined definitely by its ideal and you cannot change it unless you modify the ideal itself. A nation is a group of human beings that exists by virtue of its separation from the rest of mankind. An altruism or a

universalism extending beyond the group is incompatible with its very nature. When it ceases to be selfish, it ceases to be itself. When a nation tries to behave towards other nations morally and justly *as a principle*, its ideal changes from Nationalism to Ethics. But a half-hearted obedience to the ethical law is impossible for reasons explained previously in this book. The nation will have, therefore, either to go back to its old ideal of Nationalism or to come forward to the Right Ideal.

The internal cohesion of a national group results from the necessity that it feels to protect itself against other ideal-groups. It cannot, therefore, expand its narrower sympathies to embrace the whole of humanity so long as it remains a national group.

McDougall thinks that National Ethics and Universal Ethics can exist side by side with each other. This view is the result of a sad misunderstanding of the laws of human nature. Every ethical system is the result of an ideal of life. Human nature does not permit conscious obedience to two different ideals at the same time, nor can the ethical principles of two different ideals be ever perfectly consistent with each other. As long as a nation is in the grip of its national ideal derived from its territorial and racial sentiments, it cannot but have, in spite of its best efforts and intentions, a nominal and superficial allegiance to Universal Ethics.

Hegel and Gentile believed that the state is an end in itself and has a right to unlimited expansion. They raised it to the level of a mystical being deserving of unqualified allegiance. This view embodies a great fundamental truth provided it is applied only to the Ultimate State which will be founded on the Right Ideal. The aggression and expansion of such a state alone is reasonable and justifiable. The state is not always rational and always right as Hegel and his followers imagine but it is rational and right only when it exists and strives for the Right Ideal. The State of the Right Ideal is, so to say, the Creator Him-

self come to the earth.

The ideal of Communism supplanted Nationalism in Russia at the end of the first World War. Since that time it has stimulated a good deal of interest throughout the world and has won over a considerable number of adherents in almost all countries of the world. It is at least apparently an improvement on the national ideal and much nearer to the Final Ideology than Nationalism. It has the following points of apparent similarity with the Final Ideology :—

(1) It claims to be a complete explanation of life.

(2) It has a universal outlook.

(3) It assures economic independence and equality for all. The state of the Right Ideal will assure economic justice and equality for all because it is necessitated by the self's attributes of Truth, Goodness and Justice. Moreover, it must provide for all men the reasonable satisfaction of their fundamental economic needs because it is essential for the continuation of life and of the process of evolution. An easy satisfaction of the instinctive needs relieves the urge of self of a part of its duty of maintaining the body and enables it to satisfy its own needs more adequately than otherwise; thus it is a help to the process of evolution. The aim of all moral action, we have seen, is to help evolution directly and consciously.

(4) It is a dictatorship. Its emphasis on education, moulded to suit the needs of the ideal, the protection of the individual's faith in the ideal through a reasonable intolerance of hostile opinion and the institution of a party of the faithful (the Communist party) influencing the policy of the government by sheer will power and faith are features which the future ideology will certainly have to retain.

Marxism, however, does not satisfy the whole of our urge of self and is, therefore, *totally unsatisfactory*. It ignores the real and the most important desire of our nature, the

desire which is subserved by all our other desires, that is, the desire for Beauty, and gives us a substitute for it, which may no doubt deceive us for some time but cannot deceive us for long. It makes us submit to an ethical system which does not conform to our nature and cannot give us an enduring satisfaction. It is imperfect and does not contain all the elements of Beauty. As such it must break up in the long run and make room for another, more satisfactory ideal. Many enthusiastic Communists are pinning their hopes on Communism as the ultimate solution of all human problems. But as a matter of fact Communism is a passing phase in our history and may disappear sooner than many other ideals, leaving behind only the truth that is there in it. No need of our nature can be met permanently by means of unnatural substitutes.

While the Right Ideal makes the urge of self the end and the economic urge the means to that end, Communism looks upon the economic urge as an end in itself and tries to ignore the urge of self altogether. But when we ignore it, we only try to satisfy it by means of wrong and unsatisfactory substitutes. While the former holds out a promise of unlimited progress for men, the latter is bound to cut short our progress and disappear itself at some stage in the future.

Although Communism *appears* to have *some* qualities in common with the Final ideology, it does not mean that it *really* possesses any of these qualities. A wrong ideal always appears, at first, to have some elements of Beauty. But in due course of time, as the ideal is worked out in practice, it turns out that really it does not possess any of those elements. The reason is that the wrong qualities of such an ideal are always influencing its (apparently) right qualities in their outward practical expression and altering them and turning them into wrong qualities actually. Thus in the present case the material outlook of the Marxist philosophy can never allow it to become a complete and correct explanation of existence, to create a genuine economic equality for

all, to have a really universal outlook or to incarnate itself in a political organisation which is at once a perfect Dictatorship and a perfect Democracy like that of the Right Ideology. Qualities of the Right Ideal can never come to their own and can never find a true expression or realization unless they are expressed and realized as elements of their own ideal. An ideal which is partially right and partially wrong is always *totally* wrong and that is why it is totally abondoned and forgotten.

In modern times several philosophers have tried to interpret the events of history with a view to explain the historical process and to forecast the future of man, society and humanity. The most prominent of them are Denilevsky, Spengler, Toynbee, Schubart, Berdyaev, Northrop Kroeber, Schwitzer and Sorokin. Each of these writers counts a number of civilizations or culture-civilizations in history and talks of each as constituting a socio-cultural unity, all parts of which are integrated by a prime symbol or a philosophical presupposition or principle and having, like an organism, a birth, a youth, an old age and a death. But the theories of these writers, though very extensive and laborious, are hardly clear, complete or accurate. No one of them, for example, defines the exact nature of his culture-civilization or explains why a culture-civilization is born, why does it progress upto a certain limit, why it begins to decline and why does it ultimately die and disappear. The result is that their research does not provide us with any guidance for the future which it should be the object of social philosophy to provide. For none of them is able to say whether this process of the appearance and disappearance of civilizations is going to continue indefinitely or whether mankind is heading towards an ultimate civilization which will be safe from the operation of those laws of nature which cause a civilization to decline and disappear, what are going to be the qualities or characteristics of this ultimate civilization, or how we can create and preserve such a civilization by our own conscious planning

or endeavour.

The vagueness of these writers is due to the fact that they do not begin their study of history by analyzing and understanding, first of all, the nature of the smallest culture-civilization area which is the human individual. History is made up of the activities of the human individuals and human individuals act in accordance with the laws of their nature which are permanent and unalterable. Unless we are definite about the laws of human nature as operating in the individual, we can neither interpret history nor predict its course for the future. It is not possible to understand history as it is unfolded in the human society, unless we understand its manifestation in the human individual.

Another drawback of the theories of these writers is that none of them explains the process of history as a continuation of the evolutionary process at the material and biological stages of evolution, which it really is. The evolutionary process of the world is a single whole and its various parts can be understood only in their relation to the whole. Although the latest phase of this process, which is the process of psycho-social evolution or the historical process, must have its own special characterestics, its full significance can be understood only in the light of its past during the biological and material stages.

Karl Marx is the only social philosopher so far who has attempted to build a philosophy of history on a definite view of human nature and to explain human history as a continuation of the general evolutionary process. But since his views about the nature of evolution and the nature of the human individual are absurd, his interpretation of history is also absurd.

According to the view of human nature maintained in this book, the motivating force of all human activity whether it is individual or social is the urge for ideals. All human history is, therefore, the history of ideals.

When a number of individuals are inspired by a single ideal and are able to live and work together for its realiza-

tion, the result is the birth of an organized group of men which has been described above as an ideal-group. Ideal-groups have evolved from their primitive forms as families and tribes to the gigantic, highly organised modern states which claim to be based on philosophical or scientific ideologies. The ideal of the group is always the idea of the highest beauty and perfection known to the group and actually felt and realised by them as such for the time being. In due course of time, as members of the group make an effort to realize the ideal in practice, the values, norms and meanings embodied in the ideal and its qualities are externalized and socialized. The result is a cultural, behavioural and material incarnation and objectification of the ideal in the shape of a culture-civilization. All aspects of the life of an ideal-group, whatever may be the stage of its evolution, all its cultural, behavioural and material elements, its science, philosophy, fine arts, religion, law, way of life, social customs, habits and institutions, are created by its ideal.

An ideal-group continues to progress in all directions as long as its members remain oblivious of the hidden defects of their ideal and are able to love, adore and serve it wholeheartedly and thereby to grow their love for it to the highest possible level. When, however, the inner defects of the ideal begin to become apparent and to tell upon their love for it, their efforts begin to relax and the ideal-group begins to decline steadily, till a time comes when it is an longer able to contiune its existence. It dies and disappears. The ultimate and permanent culture-civilization can be only that which is founded on an ideal which is free from all possible defects and has all the qualities demanded by our urge for Beauty and that ideal is the Right Ideal. Man is progressing towards it slowly and steadily, impelled by the forces of evolution working within his consciousness, but he can certainly bring its advent nearer by his own conscious efforts.

The instincts of attraction and repulsion in the animal

and the physical laws of attraction and repulsion in matter, which were leading evolution during its biological and material stages respectively, are the earlier forms of the urge for Beauty which manifests itself in the human being as the love of an ideal and the hatred of everything opposed to the ideal. The urge to love an ideal is leading evolution now during its psycho-social period.

Since the spiritual influence of an ideal is always catching and always spreads not only from one individual to another but also from one group to another, it happens many a time in history that a mumber of territorial, racial and linguistic groups living close to each other come to have similar ideals inspired by one leading group in all the rest. Such is, for example, the collection of the existing national states of Europe.

Unfortunately it is such a collection or congeries of different contemporary ideal-groups, resembling each other in their ideals plus their enslaved races and nations absorbing the cultural influence of their masters which almost all our social philosophers mentioned above have described as a culture-civilization having a causal-meaningful unity. As a matter of fact an assemblage or a collection of different ideal-groups, like that of the present European states, however similar their ideals may be, can never be a really causal-meaningful unity. An independent culture-civilization that is really such a unity is never more nor less than an ideal-group. It is always a political organization or a state. A mere geographical proximity of ideal-groups belonging to a collection, or the resemblance of their ideals, or the fact that most of them come into existence, live, grow, decline and disappear almost simultaneously, does not make them a unified culture-civilization. On the contrary they are always the open or the secret enemies of each other. Each of them wants to expand and excel at the expense of every other and therefore each is at war with all the rest. In such a collection some groups may die, while others may extend the sphere

of their ideological influence at their expense.

The reason is that, when the ideal of one group is adopted by another group having its own political organization, it never remains the same ideal but undergoes a change consistent with the conditions and aspirations of the latter resulting from their geography, history, race or language. The change in the ideal may be apparently slight but, when it is considered important enough to need a separate political organization, it alters the ideal radically. The organizing and unifying force of a political group is its ideal. It can never be a different group unless it has a different ideal. The moment two separate groups or states come to have the same ideal, they cannot but merge into a single group or state.

Chapter—X

MARXISM

The fallacy of Marxism lies in the fact that it regards the economic urge as the cause of our ideals while, as a matter of fact, it is our ideals that give the economic urge whatever meaning or force it acquires. Of course, instead of ideals, Marx uses another term 'the contents of consciousness' or merely 'consciousness' which includes ideals.

Marx wrote in his '*Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy*':—

"In the social production of their subsistence men enter into determined and necessary relations with each other which are independent of their wills—production relations which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum of these production relations forms the economic structure of society, the real basis upon which a juridical or political structure arises and to which definite, social forms of consciousness correspond. The mode of production of the material subsistence conditions the social, political and spiritual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men which determines their existence but on the contrary, it is their social existence which determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development the material productive forces of society come into contradiction with the existing production relations or what is merely a juridical expression for the same thing, the property relations within which they have operated before. From being forms of development of the productive forces, these relations turn into fetters upon their development. Then comes an epoch of social revolution. With the change in the economic foundation the whole

immense superstructure is slowly or rapidly transformed. In studying such a transformation one must always distinguish between the material transformation in the economic conditions essential to production—which can be established with the exactitude of natural science—and the juridical, political, religious, artistic or philosophic, in short, ideological forms, in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. As little as one judges what an individual is by what he thinks of himself so little can one judge such an epoch of transformation by its consciousness; one must rather explain this consciousness by the contradiction in the material life, the conflict at hand between the social forces of production and the relations in which production is carried on."

Friedrich Engels, the friend of Marx, expresses the same thought briefly but more clearly as follows :—

"Marx discovered the simple fact (heretofore hidden beneath ideological overgrowths) that human beings must have food, drink, clothing and shelter first of all before they can interest themselves in Politics, Science, Art, Religion and the like. This implies that the production of the immediately requisite material means of subsistence and therewith the existing phase of development of a nation or an epoch, constitute the foundations upon which the state institutions, the legal outlooks, the artistic and even the religious ideas are built up. It implies that these latter must be explained out of the former whereas the former have usually been explained out the latter".

The idea contained in the above extracts is the very soul of the philosophy of Marx. It has served him according to his own confession as "the guiding thread" of all his studies. If, therefore, this idea is absurd (and we hope the facts adduced in this and the previous chapters will show that it is), then the theory of Marx in its entire form, *i.e.*, as a complete religio-socio-political ideology, is also absurd.

There are four main facts which lend a plausibility to this idea. Firstly, the urge of hunger is compelling in its

nature and exists before those contents of our mind which we call ideals come into existence, at least in their well-defined shape. Secondly, people generally (though not invariably) satisfy their hunger and other instinctive desires before they satisfy the other proper needs of their ideals. Thirdly, when an individual's ideal is not of an elevated character, which is very frequently the case in the earlier stages of our self-knowledge, the satisfaction and even the oversatisfaction of his fundamental economic needs forms an indispensable part of his ideal. And even when the individual's ideal is very high in the scale of beauty, he has generally to satisfy his fundamental economic needs as an end subservient to his ideal. Thus the satisfaction of these needs always forms a part of his ideal and colours visibly the manner in which he strives for the realization of his ideal in all its parts and with all its requirements. Fourthly, the maladjustment of economic conditions in a society, (like all other forms of maladjustments which result from our actions), is due to the rule of wrong ideals and, when we become conscious of this maladjustment, we become conscious also of those elements of imperfection and incorrectness in the ruling wrong ideal which bring it about. We immediately become dissatisfied with the rule of the ideal and there is a political revolution, the object of which is to establish the rule of an ideal more perfect and more in accordance with our nature in the light of the experience gained. In the new ideal we attempt to remove those elements of ugliness in the previous ideal of which we had become conscious on account of the maladjustment which it had produced.

These facts would certainly enable a superficial observer to interpret with enough of plausibility that it is only our basic economic needs that grow into the form of our ideals. When two kinds of desires, one subserving the other, are mixed up in an activity, it is so easy to mistake the subordinate desire as the fundamental cause of the activity, especially when the subordinate desire has a natural, internal compul-

sion of its own and exists before the ruling desire comes into existence or at least becomes distinct and powerful. As a matter of fact Marxism, like the psycho-analysis of Frued, is the result of a sectional view of human nature.

There is no doubt that nature in its generosity and helpfulness has made the urge of hunger compelling in itself but we *can* dominate and we *do actually* dominate its compulsion whenever necessary. We turn to the satisfaction of hunger first of all only when the ideal demands it but when the demand of the ideal is otherwise, hunger becomes our last and the least consideration. Whenever peoples' ideals are threatened, they are prepared to oppose the compulsion of hunger, to eat less and make sacrifices of all sorts and even starve themselves to death, if it is necessary for the sake of the ideal. In the recent world-war millions of Russian Communists sacrificed their lives including their fundamental economic needs quite obviously for the sake of an ideal and not for the sake of hunger, although that ideal may have been only the ideal of economic justice. It points to the fact that our more fundamental and more ultimate need is the ideal and not hunger. We satisfy our basic economic needs as means to an end and the end is always the ideal. But sometimes the desire for economic superiority is an indispensable part of our ideal. In such a case we are unable to control our desire for wealth because we have no higher altruistic motives; we are greedy.

An ideal is only the ultimate end of our actions. There are innumerable immediate ends which we must achieve before we reach the ultimate end. Each immediate end is essential for the attainment of the final end. It is subservient to the ideal but, when the ideal cannot be achieved without it, it assumes an importance equal to that of the ideal itself. We then attend to it before everything else. It appears to us as if we care for it more than we care for the ideal. As a matter of fact when we are exerting ourselves to achieve an end of this kind, we do so only for the sake of the ideal. Such is the case with our fundamental economic

needs. They assume the importance of the ideal when, as a help to the ideal, they are threatened but they lose all importance when attending to them means the neglect of the ideal. Then we satisfy the urge of self at their expense; we oppose and counteract their force.

Our fundamental economic needs arise from the biological compulsion of our instincts like feeding, clothing, shelter, sex, etc. The satisfaction of these instinctive desires is essential for the maintenance of our life and race. It is fortunate that these immediate needs have an internal compulsion of their own. But they have no more importance than the importance of means to an end. When we are eating, we are consciously or unconsciously serving the ideal and satisfying its requirements. We shall continue to eat and to maintain our health even if there were no instinctive compulsion for eating, provided we understood clearly enough that eating is essential for living. It is onacc ount of the natural compulsion of the hunger instinct that it appears to us that we eat for the sake of eating and satisfying our hunger and not for the sake of our ideal. We do not eat and live in order to eat and live but we eat and live for the sake of our ideals and the proof is that we are prepared to give up eating and living when such is the demand of the ideal. We oppose every economic need and every instinctive compulsion, sacrifice everything, including our lives, when our ideals demand this, whether the ideals are wrong or right, noble or ignoble, selfish or unselfish.

So far as our basic needs are concerned they are capable of being completely satisfied. That a person may go on accumulating wealth even after his needs are satisfied, can be due not to the basic economic urge but to the urge for ideals. In this case the person's ideal may be greed or the accumulation of wealth; that may be his estimate of beauty and power.

The chief element of beauty in Communism which attracts the rich and the poor alike to it is not the atheistic philosophy of Marx behind it but it is its message of econo-

mic justice to all, its assurance that all will get adequate means of subsistence. This is a need of the Right Ideal, and a demand of our consciousness itself. It is on account of this element of beauty, or similarity with the Right Ideal, in Communism that people mistake it for the ideal of their nature and become ready to devote themselves to it. Every action of a person who loves the Right Ideal is directed to help evolution in himself as well as in others. Nobody can satisfy the urge of self and march forward on the road of evolution unless the necessities imposed upon him by his instincts, which are themselves evolved by consciousness, are satisfied. These necessities form the immediate ends for the achievement of the ultimate end, the Right Ideal. He can, therefore, have no purpose in accumulating wealth and whatever amount of it remains over with him after the satisfaction of his needs he must make it over to people who need it. People accumulate wealth only when their ideal is wealth or when the accumulation of wealth is required by their ideal. The Right Ideal, while it requires the production of wealth as much as possible, does not require the accumulation of wealth; it requires on the other hand the distribution of wealth as much as possible. No person living in a state founded on the Right Ideal will, therefore, be permitted to accumulate wealth. Such a state will, however, see that the necessities imposed by our instincts are reasonably satisfied in the case of all persons.

Since in the history of evolution the urge of hunger came into existence before the urge of ideals, the former need not be the cause of the latter nor the latter need be the product of the former. Ideals are peculiar to man and even in him they assume a clear-cut form distinguishable from the instinctive desires only when a person's age and self-knowledge have developed sufficiently. The instinct of hunger, on the other hand, has existed since the first animal came into being. The existence of the urge of hunger prior to the urge of ideals should rather indicate the lower and subservient character of the former. Evolution is

always leading towards something better and higher. The process of evolution has its analogy in the growth of a tree. As we move forward we reach what is more valuable and more worthy of preservation; we achieve something for which the lower achievements may be sacrificed, if necessary, or which they may be made to subserve. Although the flower, the fruit, and the seed grow last of all in a tree, yet they form the highest and the most valuable products of the tree and the whole growth of the tree is subservient to the purpose of acquiring these products. Just as the urge of instincts in the animal world ruled the laws of matter, so the urge of ideals in the human stage rules the laws of instincts. An urge that develops later in the process of evolution must be the higher and the ruling urge. This is not merely a theory, but we actually see the fact of it daily in our experience. People frequently rule and sacrifice their instinctive desires for the sake of their ideals.

There is no doubt that generally, we attend, before everything else, to the satisfaction of hunger and other instinctive, compelling needs of the body. When we are hungry, we would rather eat than pray to God or indulge in Philosophy, Art or Science. But it will be wrong to conclude from this as a general law of human psychology that our economic needs matter to us more than our ideals or that the latter are the product of the former. The reason is that there are *some occasions* when we *do not* turn to the satisfaction of hunger and other compelling needs of the body *first of all*, when we sacrifice them completely for the sake of our ideals which reveal themselves to us as our foremost concern. This fact leads us to the conclusion that, when we do satisfy our economic needs before everything else, we must be doing so, consciously or unconsciously, for the sake of our ideals and as an end subservient to them, so that we may live and realize them. We are apt to ignore or underrate the force of the ideals because even when our ideals are high enough to be distinct from the instinctive desires,

it is seldom that their love is highly developed. But if we are to understand the real, natural relationship of the ideal with hunger and other instinctive desires and formulate a general law of our nature on the basis of it, we must take into consideration those rare cases also in which the ideals are high and their love is found to have been strongly developed. For example, we must take into consideration the man who fasts continuously or eats once a day or submits to other such ascetic practices in spite of opulence to please his Creator; or the man who becomes a martyr for his religion or his country or his nation; or the prophet who preaches devotion to one God to a chafing, warlike, idolatrous people at the risk of his life and cannot be bribed into silence by any amount of riches or wordly power; or the prince who leaves the luxury of his palace for a life of extreme hardships in search of nothing but truth. No reasonable, convincing explanation of such facts is possible on the Marxist view of human nature.

In the case of a man who sacrifices his life willingly for a nation or a country a Marxist may argue that he does so not because his ideal is a force independent of the economic factor but because he believes that his nation, if not he himself, will benefit economically, so that the urge to sacrifice his life is again of an economic origin. But this reasoning is extremely fallacious. It does not help us to explain *his ideal* as an outcome of *his desire for food*, since he foregoes for himself not only food but also his life for the maintenance of which food was required by him. Starting originally with the motive of feeding himself better in order to maintain his life, how can he end with destroying himself in order to feed others in a better way? It was more consistent with his original motive to eat less and continue to live himself than to die in order that others may eat more. The fact that he becomes ready to die shows that the desire which enables him to lay down his life is for something which is far more precious to him than mere eating and living, on his own part, or on the part of

those for whom he is alleged to die. That the society benefited economically after the death of the patriot does not prove that he acted for the sake of an economic gain, when we know it for certain that he himself had actually spurned such a gain. His action as a member of his community cannot but be due to his motives as an individual. The joint action of individuals must obey those very laws of human nature which hold good for each human being separately. A society is nothing but a group of individuals and the action of the society is nothing but the sum total of the actions of its individual members. This implies that even when an individual is acting in the society and for the society, he can act only on account of motives and desires that are his own and for the sake of a benefit that accrues to him *personally*. Obviously, the patriot dies for the sake of an *idea*, for the sake of a psychological or a spiritual benefit and not for any material or economic gain as a Marxist would give us to understand. His motive in sacrificing his life is no other than his love for the ideal which dominates all his other loves and desires, even his desire to live on. The benefit that comes to *him* is the satisfaction, (entirely different in character from the satisfaction we derive from the instincts), of having obeyed his ideal. In the absence of this satisfaction he would have considered himself to be a criminal and would have felt very miserable. The economic gain to the society is an incidental result of the nature of the ideal for which he sacrifices himself. He loves his ideal for its own sake and because it is the highest good, the highest beauty known to him. There are innumerable cases in which an individual becomes ready to make all sorts of sacrifices for an ideal of which the nature is such that there is no possibility of any economic gain to any body as a result of his sacrifices for that ideal.

In the earlier stages of our life as individuals as well as in the primitive stages of our history as a race, our ideals correspond to our instinctive desires so much that they

cannot be easily distinguished from them. As long as the level of our self-knowledge is very low, the urge of self and the urge of instinct correspond to each other. The impulse for the ideal finds an expression in the desires of the instincts because nothing more attractive than these desires is known to us. At this stage, naturally, the instinctive or the economic urge is the only urge that is apparent. It is in fact more conspicuous in man than it is in the animal at this stage because the impulse for the ideal adds to the force of the instinctive desires making them stronger than they really (*i.e.*, biologically, as in the animal) are. Unlike the animal which sits down quietly when its hunger is satisfied, we quarrel continuously with each other for a greater and greater satisfaction of these desires for their own sake. We behave like children who give the whole of their attention to these desires because they are unable to control them for the sake of their natural higher desires of which they are not yet conscious. This fact is very important since we have to guard against the misunderstanding that it creates. On account of it, we are apt to overrate the importance of the economic urge and to regard it as fundamental throughout. We forget that the coincidence of the urge of self and the urge of instinct pertains to a particular stage of our development. As our self-knowledge grows beyond this stage, the urge of self comes more and more into its own, our ideals become more and more separated from the instinctive desires which they begin to rule. Slowly, they rise higher from the body and its instincts as a balloon rises gradually from the earth. But while they rise above the body and its needs, they are not cut off entirely from it. They rise above it in order to rule it and to use it as an instrument in their own service more and more efficiently. They rise from a lower perfection to a higher perfection. They approach nearer and nearer to Beauty, Goodness and Truth which constitute the object of our innate desire in the urge of self. Since they have a source independent of the instincts, *their development and evolu-*

tion also have a law of their own.

After all there must be some reason why our political, religious or philosophical ideals and ideologies, even if they are determined by the economic factor and even if they are unconscious and distorted reflections of economic conditions develop around the abstract ideas of Goodness, Beauty and Truth alone. Why is it that they partake of these very qualities in one form or another more or less? Why is it that they approach these very qualities more and more as our knowledge of ourselves is growing? Even when trying to remove economic maladjustments we express our eagerness for democracy, truth, equality, fraternity, liberty, justice, freedom, morality and such like notions. Is it then too much to say that we have a desire for these qualities as we have a desire for food? These qualities, understood to the best of our knowledge, are our common desire, whenever we are struggling for a social change, whether as French revolutionaries or as American soldiers in the War of Independence or as the peasants of England headed by Wat Tyler and Jack Straw or as the Communists of Lenin or as the crusaders of Richard or as the Protestants of Luther or as the followers of Colet, Erasmus and More, the Leaders of the Renaissance. The desire for Beauty, Goodness and Truth in their greater and greater perfection is the urge of our nature, our self. Whenever we awake to it, we discover it to be far stronger than our desire for food, or the desire for life itself. The urge of self can never be disobeyed, although it can be often misunderstood so that we often take a part of it for the whole. There is no doubt that Marx himself acted as an unwitting servant of this urge, when he created his revolutionary philosophy infused with a fervour for justice and freedom, or when he summoned the labourers of the world to action. Throughout his philosophy he has emphasised justice, equality and freedom, abstract slogans which are appropriate to a man of religion.

The desire for justice is a part of the urge of self;

justice is desired not only by Marx and his followers but by all of us to whatever economic class we may belong, provided we become really conscious of it. Whenever we become really conscious of injustice, we hate it not only because it means an economic loss to us but also and more fundamentally because it is our nature to love justice and to hate injustice. The proof is that we hate injustice not only when it is done to us but also when it is done to others; and we hate it in everything, not only in matters of money and apportionment or wealth but also in judgments of personal excellence, honour, capability and character against ourselves or others. When we become really conscious of injustice, we hate it again not only in others but also in ourselves. And honour and character are by no means money-earning equipments; rather we frequently sacrifice money to preserve them.

The cause of social and political revolutions as explained by Marx contains but a fraction of truth. All social and political revolutions are due to the urge of self. This urge, we have noticed, is a definite desire of our nature capable of being definitely known and satisfied, although we seldom care to understand it definitely. But whether we understand it definitely or not it is always goading us to act in obedience to itself to the extent to which we understand it. It is this desire which makes us feel what is right and what is wrong, what is desirable and what is undesirable. It is this desire which calls attention to the conditions that need to be changed. In its absence we would be contented with anything that happens to be our lot and we would act only when compelled by our psycho-physical dispositions which we possess in common with the lower animals. It gives meaning to the conditions, whether they are economic or otherwise, against which we rebel in the case of social revolutions. The conditions are known as unsatisfactory because of our desire for Beauty. They are brought about by ideals which are lacking in Beauty and which happen to have gained in power and established their rule.

The elements of imperfection or ugliness in the ideal are reflected completely and accurately in the conditions that they create.

An ideal is discovered as wrong in the course of action. If it is wrong, it makes us act in such a way that we involve ourselves in difficulties, that is, action in obedience to a wrong ideal creates conditions which are unsatisfactory to us. For example, there appears an extremely unequal distribution of wealth resulting in an extreme poverty for some persons and extreme opulence for others or crime and moral laxity become alarmingly frequent or we have incessant wars which we do not know how to avoid. Unsatisfactory conditions whether they are economic, moral, physical or intellectual established by the ruling wrong ideal make us conscious of the unsatisfactory nature of the ideal causing it. The more intolerable the conditions that a wrong ideal brings about the quicker and deeper is our consciousness of the elements of ugliness that it contains.

Since generally our self-knowledge is very poor, so long as the conditions do not become unbearable, we continue to admire the ideal that creates them more or less. But a highly self-conscious man knows long before the ideal is actually abandoned that it can have no permanence and cannot bring about anything but misery and harm to the society that entertains it. As soon as we become fully conscious of the aspects of imperfection in an ideal, owing to the unsatisfactory conditions brought about by it, we proceed to change it resorting to action as vigorous as possible. This action is aimed at, and results in, a social revolution. As long as we act half-heartedly, our consciousness of ugliness in the ideal is incomplete. Having over-thrown the rule of the old ideal, which is discovered by us to be wrong, we establish the rule of a new ideal in which we avoid the elements of ugliness which the old ideal contained.

But in the absence of a sufficient knowledge of Beauty, while we avoid the known elements of imperfection in the

new ideal, we generally introduce some other unknown elements of imperfection into it from which we suffer later on. Under the rule of the Right Ideal, established really in every heart, there would be no economic maladjustments or other unsatisfactory conditions and there would be no social revolutions and no changes of social formation.

Our ideals are indeed datermined by circumstances in this sense that, as soon as the circumstances become intolerable, we understand the wrong elements in the ideal that creates them and consequently desire a new ideal. The change may, therefore, be considered as the result of circumstances in a sense. Really the change is due to *that meaning* which we impart to circumstances on account of our innate desire for Beauty. We should not lose sight of the fact that we change to a new ideal because we want new conditions and we discard the old ideal because the conditions brought by it were undesirable. In discarding the old ideal and adopting a new one we give proof of our conviction, conscious or unconscious, that conditions are determined by our ideals or, to use a term of Marx, by our "consciousness" and not that our "consciousness" is determined by conditions, economic or otherwise. Lenin destroyed the rule of the old ideal in Russia because he wanted to establish a new set of economic conditions which necessitated the rule of a new ideal, the ideal of Communism.

That the cause of social revolutions is the urge of self and not the economic urge becomes apparent only when we consider the higher stages of self-knowledge, when our ideals begin to rise above and govern our individual instinctive desires. Of course, the ideal, however much it may rise in the scale of Beauty, remains closely related to our economic needs in this sense that the manner in which we satisfy these needs is one of the ways in which our love for the ideal expresses itself. The ideal has to rule the instinctive desires in order to realize itself. Just because we strive for the ideal for its own sake we cannot help affecting the manner in which we satisfy our instinctive desires on

account of it. It conditions the manner in which we satisfy these desires as individuals and as a society. This manner is sometimes desirable and sometimes undesirable depending upon the standard of perfection that our ideal has achieved, and the approach that it has been able to make to the qualities of Beauty, Goodness and Truth. When it is undesirable, our desire for Beauty tests it and discovers it as such. Then we feel the need to change the ideal that is responsible for it. The change takes place away from those aspects of ugliness and towards those aspects of Beauty of which we have become conscious.

Our ideals are judgments of beauty, depending upon our knowledge and innate capacities which vary from man to man. The same events are judged differently by different persons because their knowledge, understanding or intuition differs. Our ideals or philosophical creeds therefore cannot be determined by economic conditions or modes or phases of production. They follow a law of their own; they have their own history, their own development.

Far from the mode of production determining the consciousness of men it is their consciousness which determines production and its modes.

Let us consider why is it that the phases of production change at all. They change evidently on account of a continuous extension and complication of our wants. Men produce wealth because they need wealth and they produce it at every stage of their evolution in a manner which, according to them, best fits their needs at that stage. The nature of what Marx denotes as "the productive forces" is nothing but man himself acting on matter or environment in response to his own nature. It is not "men" who are "determined by a definite development of their productive forces", as Marx imagines, but it is the development of productive forces which is determined by men, by their desires and activities, by their increasing knowledge and by their discoveries of new facts and possibilities following their

research and exploration in obedience to the promptings of their nature. Marx is wrong when he says "What individuals are depends upon the material conditions of their production". It is in fact the individuals who alter, maintain, accept or reject, the material conditions of production to suit themselves, their nature and their desires.

The continuous extension and complication of our wants are due to an insatiable desire for Beauty. All the wealth that we produce is not required for the mere satisfaction of hunger and such like instinctive desires. Our wants are not really as extensive and as complicated as we have made them. We share our fundamental needs with our ancestors, the cave-men of old. The modern man eats, drinks, clothes and shelters himself and the cave man used to indulge in the same activities. That these needs of the cave-man were satisfied by him fully and adequately can be judged from the fact that he was able to live on, prosper and have an off-spring which is the human race of to-day. The modern civilized man too can satisfy these basic needs of his fully and adequately by living like the cave-man but actually the manner in which he satisfies them is vastly different from that of the dwellers of the cave. The difference is created only by our desire for beauty which has been finding ever greater and greater expression in the manner of our living through the ages. Thus there has been an evolution in our wants as well as in the modes of production. The modes of production would not have changed at all unless our wants had grown in all directions.

We already know that our desire for beauty has many aspects. We express it in four different ways, in the love of ideals, in moral action, in the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake and in art. Of these ways of loving beauty the first one is the most important and the most comprehensive, since our ideal is, to the best of our knowledge, the whole of the beauty that we desire. Other ways in which we express our love for beauty only subserve the

ideal, directly or indirectly. Art was defined as the expression of beauty in brick, stone, colour, voice, sound, word, or movement. But there is another variety of art which consists in the expression of beauty in the manner of living that is in the manner in which we satisfy our desires. It is indulged in by all human beings more or less at all times but it has reached its highest standard so far in the life of the modern man. It is this art which we designate by the name of *civilization*.

Just study the living of a civilized man of today. There is beauty in the cut, quality, and combination of colours of his dress. There is beauty in the design and shape of his residential house, its furniture, equipment and decoration. There is beauty in the appearance and arrangement of his chairs, tables, books, carpets, sofas, wall pictures and other articles in his room. There is beauty in the manner he talks, eats, drinks, travels, plays and behaves generally. In order to introduce beauty into the manner of living, he requires not only material objects but also personal excellence, polish, education and training. His taste or his desire for beauty which we find reflected in his material possessions is in fact guided by his knowledge, education and training. As our knowledge grows, we are able to live a more and more refined and artistic life. When you meet a modern man of average means in his drawing room, you are impressed with him as an artist of a type. To live a civilized and decent life is an art and belongs to the same category as the painting of a beautiful picture. Like every other variety of art, it is due to our urge for beauty. *In the effort to express beauty in the manner of living we extend our needs and make them more and more complicated.* We express beauty not only in the material articles that we produce but also in the manner in which we produce them. The extension and complication of our needs on account of our urge for beauty both as consumers and producers accounts for the changing phases of production.

Economists, Professor Marshall being one of them, tell

us that we multiply our needs on account of our desire for variety or desire for comfort or desire for distinction. But when we examine these motives closely, they turn out to have their source in our desire for beauty. We love variety in our dress, food and other requirements because of our desire for beauty which is insatiable. Whenever we attribute charm to an object or feel an attraction for it, we do so on account of our innate desire for beauty. But nothing is permanently attractive except consciousness or the source of beauty itself. A continued contact with the object reveals the fact that, after all, it is not as charming as we thought it to be. Its beauty proves unreal because it does not go with us the whole length of our desire; it does not grow with our desire and, therefore, does not satisfy the whole of it. Then we feel the monotony of associating with the object; we become tired of it and look for beauty in something else, in other words, we desire variety. The love of variety is, therefore, really due to the love of beauty; we desire a different object to associate with in the hope that it will be more satisfactory to our insatiable desire for beauty. The desire for a different object is a conscious or unconscious de ire for a more beautiful object.

Even when we desire variety for the sake of self-display or social distinction, it is due to our desire for beauty. Social distinction is obtained by conveying an impression of beauty and thereby winning the approval or admiration of society which is really the society's response to beauty. We win social distinction by displaying beauty in our dress, in our material possessions, in our abilities, character and the way of living generally. Our sense of social distinction is synonymous with the sense of approval of persons we love or admire, that is, of persons to whom we attribute beauty or perfection. It is secured by expressing beauty in ourselves which is also a way of loving beauty in others. Thus the desire for distinction is also at bottom a desire for beauty.

It is the same innate desire for beauty, the same artistic sense, so conspicuous, developed and trained in the modern

man which impelled the cave-man to come out of his cave and build a hut of twigs to live in. The possibility of a new way of seeking shelter, more comfortable than the first, was suggested to him by this desire.

A refined method of satisfying a need is desired by us initially not on account of the comfort that attends it but on account of the desire for beauty that it satisfies. For we see that people sometimes undergo an unproportionate discomfort in order to secure the comfort that results from a new artistic combination of the material means of satisfying a need. The increase of comfort is a proof only of the increased harmony we succeed in establishing between our needs and the means of satisfying them and harmony is nothing but beauty. It is true that, after sometime, when, on the one hand, the use of the article becomes monotonous and, on the other, we become used to comfort, we think more of the comfort that it brings than the desire for beauty that it satisfies. Then we imagine that it is less beautiful than it should be and we wish to have it refined still further.

Comfort implies an easier achievement of purpose; it implies efficiency.

The more comfortable thing is the more efficient thing. Efficiency in its turn is connected closely with the ideal. Before ascribing efficiency to an object we determine the purpose, the end or the ideal for which it is efficient. An article that is useful and efficient for one man may be entirely useless and inefficient for another who has a different ideal, end or purpose in view. Efficiency, therefore, means power for the realization of our ends or ideals. As such, it cannot be distinguished from beauty. Efficiency is beauty because it is power. The moment we think of efficiency, we think of a quicker possible approach to our ideal, we think, that is, of beauty itself. An efficient object reflects the beauty of the ideal. We have known that we attribute beauty not only to our ideal but also to all those subservient ends which bring the ideal nearer to

us. Really these ends are not apart from the ideal; they are within the ideal and that is why they are attractive to us. Thus since the capacity to give comfort is the same thing as efficiency and efficiency is beauty, our desire for comfort is a desire for beauty. Here it is necessary to repeat that our free desire for beauty which is a characteristic of the urge of self is different from that lower type of attraction which is compelled by the urge of our animal instincts and must not be confused with it.

Again, it is not necessity that compels us to have a more complicated system of wants than the cave-man had. Necessity has a different meaning for different persons, of different tastes, understanding and education. Of two men having the same income one may feel the necessity to live a more decent life than the other because he has a greater desire for beauty or, what is the same thing, he has a better taste and a better sense of decency. He may feel it necessary to own a car or a radio or to have a high class furniture, equipment or crockery in his house, while the other may *justly* feel that he can do without many of these things. So far as the bare necessity that is involved in our wants is concerned, it is no more than what the cave-man used to feel. This necessity was fully satisfied by the cave-man because he was able to maintain his life very well and have a progeny which is the modern man. All our wants *beyond those that correspond to the bare satisfaction of our instinctive animal desires* are unnecessary as far as we are animals; they are necessary as far as we are men. They are created by our desire for beauty as men. As human beings we not only need to satisfy our instinctive desires but we also want to satisfy them more and more beautifully and artistically. Even if it is necessity which makes us extend our wants more and more, it is similar to the necessity which the painter feels of having a particular shade of colour in a particular part of his picture. It has its source in our desire for beauty. Necessity is no doubt the mother of

invention but we have to consider why it is that we continue to feel one necessity after another and go on inventing without a stop. It is no doubt on account of our desire for ever greater and greater beauty and perfection. We can, therefore, safely modify the statement and say that the desire for Beauty is the mother of invention. The standard of that art which we call civilization is improving and our life is increasing in beauty, at least in one of its aspects, as fresh ideas are enabling us to add to our wants.

Our instinctive desires are, no doubt, the fundamental cause of our efforts to produce wealth; wealth develops mainly around the necessity that we feel of satisfying these desires as ideals or as servants of ideals. But we must make a sharp distinction between the necessity that we feel of satisfying the needs for which we feel a biological compulsion and the necessity that we feel of satisfying those needs, of a spiritual origin, which grow around them on account of our desire for a refined living. The former are our fundamental instinctive needs as animals and the latter constitute the superfluous additions that we make to them on account of our desire for beauty as human beings. The latter, spiritual in characer, overgrow around the nucleus of the former which are of a biological nature. There is no doubt that on account of habit and personal conviction a certain amount of overgrowth varying in degree for various persons becomes as necessary to us as the central nucleus. We do not want to live entirely like animals, as far as possible. Many people would rather starve themselves to death in a famine than eat what they hate. But the fact remains that a majority of our wants is merely superfluous so far as the maintenance of our life is concerned. There is a level upto which we must satisfy our instinctive needs in order to live on. As our income grows, we are able to satisfy more and more of our additional wants and rise higher and higher above the level of the barest needs. As our income decreases, we are less and less able to satisfy our additional needs and come nearer and

nearer that level.

The activity of our intellect in the search of knowledge helps us to improve the standard of the art of living. As our knowledge grows, we are able to give a greater and greater expression to our desire for beauty in the manner of living. The pursuit of knowledge for its own sake is itself an aspect of the urge of self. As we satisfy this aspect of our desire for beauty, we increase our power to live a more refined life. With the growth of scientific knowledge we are able to produce the means of life more and more easily, in larger quantities and at less and less cost and effort. We refine not only the articles that we produce but also the methods and the instruments by which we produce them. The instruments themselves become articles of need and require other instruments for their production. In this way the instruments of production go on improving and our wants go on complicating and refining more and more. Education and training become essential for such production and add to the list of our wants arising from the desire for beauty.

Karl Marx takes the idea of contradiction and movement in matter by inversion from Hegel but his conception is only a travesty of a truth. As a matter of fact there is no more contradiction between 'productive forces' and 'production relations' than there is between the two states of a man who first of all opens a tap to have a bath and then discovers that he has to adjust his position to receive the flowing water on his body or of a man who switches on the light in his room to read a book and then finds that he must (at the cost of some inconvenience to himself) open the book and adopt a suitable posture to read it. In his search for beauty man is always adjusting himself to himself. This is true of the human individual as well as of the human society and we are familiar with the close analogy between an individual and a group. It is not merely an analogy; a perfectly organized group is an individual from a scientific point of view. As there is a consciousness of the human

individual so there is a consciousness of the human society and the urge of consciousness in each case is to seek more and more of beauty. Some of the limbs of the individual create a change in the environment which the individual desires and his other limbs or rather the individual as a whole adjusts himself to this change. By this adjustment the individual goes in for the full benefit of the change that he had himself initiated. In the case of the human society some men initiate the change which is really desired by the society as a whole and other individuals or rather the society as a whole adjusts itself to this change. By this adjustment the society goes in for the full benefit of the change that it had itself initiated. It is this adjustment that Karl Marx describes as the change of 'production relations' to suit 'productive forces' as if "production relations" and "productive forces" are fundamentally opposed to each other.

Unfortunately Marx does not realize that the new productive forces and the new production relations are both the creation of society; both originate in the same unconscious and yet powerful urge of the human society to advance a step nearer to beauty and perfection in everything. Every change of environment, every new development of productive forces that man brings about *or accepts*, is for the sake of a greater satisfaction of his urge for beauty. When the society has brought about and adjusted itself to one change, we have one set of production relations and, when it has brought about and adjusted itself to the next, we have another set of such relations. The change of society from one mode of production to another comes as a result of the general will of the society originating in their urge for Beauty. Some men may, no doubt, find it difficult to adjust themselves to a change brought about by their more imaginative and enterprising brothers but, because the change happens to be more satisfactory to the nature of man, the society as a whole welcomes it and these men cannot resist it. The new production relations are not independent of

the will of society as a whole, although they may be independent of the will of some individuals temporarily.

Marx had stated that men are 'determined by a definite development of their productive forces' and that production relations are 'independent of their wills.' But it seems that subsequent Communist philosophy has moulded or reinterpretted such statements of his with a view to bring them nearer to facts. 'Man', 'say the writers of "*A Text Book of Marxist Philosophy*," is conditioned but not determined by social structure and the stage of economic development.' (p. 21). Again they write, "Man is partly determined by his environment. But his relation to his environment is not a static one. In the first place the environment itself is as much the creation of man as man is the creation of environment. Interaction is continuous. The changes wrought by man react on man himself and then man proceeds to yet further changes."

But this latter statement is still misleading. It is certainly incorrect in the sense in which it is intended by its authors, that is, as suggesting that there is a real conflict between man and the change of environment which is created or accepted by man. Man adjusts himself to a change of environment favourable to himself for the sake of a greater satisfaction of his desire for beauty. We cannot say, therefore, that the environment has changed him in spite of him. When the change of environment is unfavourable to him and comes in spite of him, he tries to resist it, oppose it and minimize its adverse effects as much as he can; he tries to change the environment again instead of changing himself. Man is continuously bringing about or accepting changes of environment that suit his desires and opposing and rejecting changes that do not suit them. He changes the environment but the desires of his own nature have a definite character and it is these desires which make man what he is. We can realize and satisfy these desires more and more but we cannot change them.

Whenever it appears to us that man has changed on

account of the change of environment, what has really happened is that either the change of environment was favourable to man and he has learnt to exploit it for a fuller satisfaction of his unchangeable desires or it was unfavourable to him and he has learnt to resist successfully its interference with the satisfaction of these desires. In neither case has man changed himself fundamentally. Man's relation to his environment is certainly not static but it is so because his desire for beauty is insatiable and he is himself dynamic and progressive.

To conclude the above discussion, the gradual increase in our wants, together with the means of satisfying them and the consequent changes in the modes of production are due to our desire to introduce more and more of beauty into the manner of living. Since artistic ideals, developing as they do gradually in standard with the growth of knowledge, have to be included in the term 'consciousness' used by Marx, it follows that a large part of our 'social existence' and 'material life' which, according to Marx, determines our 'consciousness' is itself determined by our 'consciousness.' Man *is* his 'consciousness', his desire for beauty in the form of art of all kinds including the art of civilization and in the form of morals, religion, philosophy and science. Take away 'consciousness' from man and nothing remains of him except the animal. He will still eat, drink, seek shelter and satisfy his other instinctive needs to the last limit of necessity, no doubt, but that is exactly what the animal also does. He will not only have no religion, no politics and no philosophy but will also be unable to produce or reproduce anything. All production and reproduction peculiar to man, whatever the phase through which it is passing and whatever the mode in which it is carried on, is due to his "consciousness" or his desire for beauty which includes his taste for art in all its varieties.

The desire for wealth over and above that which is necessary for the maintenance of life is, however, a restricted form of our desire for beauty. It is confined to the expres-

sion of beauty in the manner in which we satisfy our needs. Naturally, therefore, wealth does not satisfy the whole of our urge of self. By far the most important form in which we express this urge is the love of an ideal. We ascribe to the ideal the whole of the beauty that we desire. The ideals, therefore, rule our desire for wealth. But we must allow for the fact that, although we always make the best choice that we can, our ideals are not always of the highest perfection. They are noble or ignoble, worthy or unworthy, according as they have more or less of beauty in them. Sometimes our ideal is so low and so close to the instinctive desires that it is unable to rule them. In such a case wealth itself is our ideal and we are greedy and selfish. In such a case we may be civilized but we are not cultured. Just as civilization is the standard of beauty we achieve in the manner of living, culture is the standard of beauty we achieve in our ideal. Civilization and culture must go hand in hand. Civilization without culture is dangerous.

When wealth is imagined to be the ideal of a man, it is not strictly speaking his ultimate desire. Every ideal is a social ideal because the nature of self is social. The real and ultimate desire of the self is for a companion, a self or a person. The ideal, therefore, takes the form of an approval of some person or persons. The ideal has always some social reference whether this reference is clear or vague, definite or indefinite, conscious or unconscious. Wealth is desired by us for the sake of some approval that we seek through it. Most of the wealth that a man may hanker after, at present, will have no attraction for him should he come to know that he is all alone in the world. The greater portion of what Marx understands as the material life of man is, therefore, really his spiritual life. It is *determined by an idea* and not by any material object.

All wealth-production is in the service of the ideal. Wealth serves the ideal first of all by maintaining our life. But there is another important way in which it serves the ideal. The immediate object of whatever wealth is produc-

ed by us over and above the lowest limit of our biological necessities is no doubt the joy of having satisfied our desire for beauty in the manner of living. But by improving upon the manner in which the primitive man used to satisfy his instinctive desires we increase simultaneously our efficiency and power which we harness in the service of the ideal. Every ideal is badly in need of efficiency and power. Since unlimited expansion is the demand of every ideal, an ideal can expand only at the expense of other ideals. It is, for this reason, engaged in a continuous war with other ideals and finds itself increasingly in need of power to cope successfully with rival ideals. This power consists of various factors, *e.g.*, the standard of the ideals' beauty and the numerical, moral, physical, intellectual and economic strength of men who love it. The higher the standard of an ideal's beauty and the greater the number and efficiency of its adherents and helpers, the greater the power that the ideal commands.

Economic well-being is an important form of efficiency and power for an ideal. It is necessary for an ideal-group, if it is to participate successfully in the mutual struggle of ideals not only for the maintenance of its own life but also for the satisfaction of its natural desire for expansion. When the economic instrument improves, the ideal is able to expand and enlarge its power. Whenever it does so, it is able to make the economic instrument still more efficient and the efficiency of the instrument increased in this way is utilized by the ideal again to expand itself further.

The extent to which the ideal is able to satisfy its own needs of expansion depends partly upon those economic conditions which the ideal-group has succeeded in setting up in the service of the ideal. The ideal has to take notice of these conditions always in order to improve them and to continue to adjust them more and more to its own needs. The economic instrument is prepared by the ideal as a partial help to itself and the ideal is strengthened by the instrument in part. Receiving help from the instrument and fashion-

ing and improving the instrument on the part of the ideal go on simultaneously mixed up with each other. Thus the way in which we strive for the ideal is conditioned by the economic factor. But all along it is the ideal that determines the economic factor and rules it and it is the economic factor that serves the ideal. When Marx says that "the mode of production of the material subsistence conditions the social, political and spiritual life process in general," he is right and we have to agree with him for reasons explained above. But when in the same breath he says, "it is the social existence of men that determines their consciousness" he oversteps the limits of his previous statement and substitutes it by an assertion which he does not care to prove, as if it is merely a repetition of the former. He carelessly confuses the determining cause with the limiting condition.

Wealth acquires its proper place only when it is subserving the Right Ideal. In such a case there can be no economic injustice, no greed, no unnecessary, unjust or harmful equality or inequality in the distribution of wealth. But in the absence of the rule of the Right Ideal the internal or external check on injustice is absent and, since every body has the freedom to acquire as much wealth as he likes, there appears necessarily a great variety in the standards of wealth achieved by different persons. This gives rise to the so-called "economic classes" ranging one above the other. A mere economic class is never a united group of men. The individuals in an economic class have nothing in common with each other except perhaps their vocations or the approximation of their incomes to a certain standard. They behave as individuals and not as a class. More often than not they are the enemies of each other.

The "struggle of economic classes" of which Marx has made so much in his theory is a highly misleading term. No struggle is possible without the drive of the ideal. Every human struggle is *essentially* the struggle of ideals and not that of economic classes. Moreover what Marx understands as the struggle of classes is really the struggle of indivi-

duals. It is the struggle of one individual against every other individual who comes in his way, whether he belongs to his own class or to a class above him or to a class below him. The motive power of this struggle is the ideal which is indeed the motive power of all our actions. It is controlled, checked or re-inforced by the force of the ideal. The economic gain which the individual may aim at in this struggle acquires whatever force or importance it does acquire, on account of his ideal. Every individual of every economic class has his ideal, whether he is a guild-master or a journey man, a feudal lord or a serf, a bourgeois or a proletarian. An economic class becomes a united group of men capable of joint action only when their ideal becomes one. In such a case it is an ideal-group and not merely an economic class. It is *essentially* the similarity of ideas that creates a unity and a homogeniety in a group of men and not the similarity of vocations or incomes. There are several ideals in every economic class and several classes in every ideal-group.

Individuals, even when they belong to the same economic class, must remain at war with each other (for example, when trying to excel others of their class in canvassing and attracting customers) so long as their views and ideals do not coincide. On the other hand persons having the same ideal will have a unity among them, although they may belong to different economic classes and have different standards of income or wealth. They will go to the length of willingly sharing their wealth among themselves, if they become conscious that their ideal requires it. Whenever men acted jointly in history, they did so because they had a common ideal. No economic class of men is ever able to act jointly unless they come to have a single ideal or some one succeeds in inspiring them with a single ideal by means of education and propaganda.

When Marx and Engels wrote their Communists Manifesto ending with the words, "Workers of the world unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains," they did so

because they felt the necessity of a common ideal for the workmen. It is a proof of their unconscious conviction that it is the idea or the ideal that rules our actions and makes us into a united group of men and not the economic factor. Moreover, in order to create a single ideal among the workmen, Marx laid stress on the injustice that was being done by the bourgeoisie to the proletariat and thereby appealed to the latter's sense of justice and desire for freedom, qualities the desire for which forms a part of the urge of self. It was because of his unconscious belief that the workers will act only in obedience to a desire for the expression of these qualities that he needed to awaken this desire. Whenever people become conscious of the needs of justice which is an aspect of beauty, they become ready to serve it, no matter to what economic class they belong. We struggle *fundamentally* for the ideal. The struggle for the ideal is not necessarily of an economic character. It is a struggle for everything, whether of a moral or material nature, that we require in the service of the ideal.

A person's ideal is an idea which is most satisfactory to him and for which he feels the greatest attachment. When a number of individuals come to have the same ideal, their attachment for a common ideal creates a unity and a harmony among them. When an economic class is struggling for an economic advantage, it can be due to one of the two reasons:—Either the ideal of every member of the class without exception is that economic gain for which they are struggling or the desired economic gain is an end which can subserve equally a large number of different ideals entertained by different persons in this group.

In so far as they have the same ideal they will act in perfect unity; they form an ideal-group and not merely an economic class. They belong to the same category as a set of religious fanatics fighting a crusade heedlessly of all economic losses to themselves. In the former case the ideal is wealth, in the latter case it is God. The ideal of each group is the idea of beauty as understood by the members of the

group. Each group struggles for a change which they think is in the right direction. The driving force in each case is the ideal.

In so far as these persons have different ideals but the same sub-servient end they are not united permanently. As soon as the sub-servient end is gained, each will be ruled by his own ideal. It is also possible that some individuals in the group may be required by their ideal to part company with other men in the group in the course of the struggle. Then we shall see cases of faithlessness to the so-called "class-interests." But the faithlessness of these individuals to the class is really their faithfulness and loyalty to their own ideals. Experience has shown that it is really very difficult to make an economic class composed of persons of different ideals to act with perfect unity. Their ideals have first to be harmonized by means of education in all its suitable devices before they can act harmoniously. This is one reason why the Trade Union Movement started in England in the beginning of the 19th century could not be successful. This is one of the reasons also why the workers of England and America have not yet been able to feel one with those of Russia in their scheme of creating proletarian revolutions in all countries of the world. It is a fact of history that as often as the Communists of Europe tried to form a Communists' association composed of workers of various nationalities, it was shattered by disunion. *Workmen of different ideals and ideologies cannot act together.*

As soon as our ideal has developed sufficiently to become distinct from the instinctive desires, we cease to behave like animals. We manifest a new attitude, the human attitude, towards life. The economic urge ceases to appear as our only urge. The ideal or the sense of right or wrong created by the ideal becomes the driving force of our actions. The ideal may be very low and we may err miserably in judging what is right but nevertheless we do only what we *think* to be right. Sometimes it may be right for us to the best of our knowledge to procure an economic gain. Then we

struggle for it. On another occasion it may be right to sacrifice it. Then we sacrifice it willingly. Before performing every act we label it as "right" and not as "economically beneficial" even when we know that the result of our action will be an economic gain. The fact that our judgments may be wrong or right, may vary from person to person or may be conscious or unconscious does, not alter the conclusion.

If the judgment is wrong or if it varies for different persons, it is due to a low stage of self-consciousness. If it is unconscious, it is still present in our minds and we can know its presence by introspection. Even a thief or a robber pacifies his conscience by means of arguments to justify his crimes. He obtains a sanction or a verdict of "right" from his conscience before committing the theft or the robbery. Even he has a standard of right or wrong, although we may consider his standard to be very low. A wrong judgment is due to a lack of self-knowledge but the consciousness of right or wrong has a course of evolution leading upto the highest knowledge of self. Economics like Politics is subordinate to Ethics. A bad Economics like bad Politics is invariably the result of bad Ethics. The economic man or the political man is the ethical man first of all. In fact Economics, Politics and Ethics cannot be separated from each other. The economic man is at once the political as well as the ethical man.

Wherever there is an arithmetical inequality in the distribution of wealth, we know it easily and tolerate it, or rather take it as a matter of course, although it reflects undesirable social conditions. The mere *existence* of undesirable social conditions or even the existence of *the knowledge that they exist* is not enough to bring about a change. We have to become conscious of the fact that they are *undesirable.* This consciousness must have its source evidently in some internal standard of what is desirable and what is undesirable, what is wrong and what is right, and not in some standard of what is more or what is less economically or monetarily.

The consciousness of more or less existed already but it was helpless and unable to achieve anything. Of these two kinds of consciousness it is the former consciousness that induces action and not the latter.

We act only when the consciousness of what is "desirable" or "right" comes to us, although the economic conditions demanding social change may have been known to us and may have existed long before the dawn of this consciousness. It is a proof that our action starts *fundamentally* in the service of this consciousness, this *idea*, and not in the service of any economic gain. This is also proved by the fact that our action intended to bring about a change comes to a stop, when the economic gain has reached a definite limit, which limit is again determined by the idea of what is "desirable" or "right." If our fundamental object had been to gain economically, then, having once started to act for the achievment of this object, we should have continued to act and to gain economically to any extent. We stop at a certain limit because we fight essentially for what is right and not for what is more useful economically or what is greater as a mathematical quantity in money. Before opposing a system we judge it as wrong and condemn it. The source of this judgement is a criterion in our nature and we have always to depend upon this criterion alone when we want to invite a class or a group of men to action. Marx and Engles too had to depend upon it when they wrote their Manifesto. This criterion takes the form of an urge which constitutes a sort of a power-house that supplies the energy we require for all our actions.

Original thought in philosophy is the fore-runner of political revolutions because philosophy deals with ideals, the source of which is the urge of self. When old ideals lose their attraction for us, we are able to see the beauty of new ideals advocated by philosophy and feel attracted towards them irresistibly. The philosophy of Rouseau brought about the French Revolution in the nineteenth century as the philosophies of Gentile and Karl Marx brought about

the Fascist and the Communist revolutions in the present century.

The need of organising and educating the labourers by propaganda is a proof that the efforts of the labourer to create revolutions in capitalist countries are not due merely to his desire to get more wealth for himself. This desire was always there but all by itself it was so weak that the labourer did not and could not exert himself for it. Moreover it was subservient to ideals of national peace, national solidarity, imperialism, misunderstood religion, contentment, etc., and it could not, therefore, acquire sufficient force to induce vigorous action for its own satisfaction. It was necessary to make it independent of the ideals that were ruling it in order to enable it to have its own way. It was necessary to raise it to the standard of the principal desire from its position as a subordinate desire. In order to make it sufficiently powerful it was essential not only to liberate it from the domination of another powerful desire in us, that is, the desire for the ideal but also to reinforce it by that desire. Both these objects could merge into one and could be achieved simultaneously by replacing the various existing ideals of the proletariat, by a single suitable ideal compatible with the purpose of the Communist revolutionary. It is this replacement and change of ideals that is aimed at by the theories of so-called "scientific-socialism" and propaganda for the organization and education of the worker, which are really devices of a spiritual approach to his heart. Their object is to disengage the labourer's natural, innate desire for the ideal which is being utilized by different ideals for the time being and make it free and available to add its force to the force of his already existing weak and inactive desire for more wealth.

The source of every ideal is the urge of self for beauty, some aspects of which are justice and freedom which include economic justice and economic freedom, qualities which are particularly attractive to the Communist. The Communist propaganda is, therefore, intended to awaken this aspect

of the urge of self in the labourer and make it so attractive in his eyes as to surpass in beauty every ideal which may be ruling him, so attractive that his love for it may overpower his love for every existing ideal with which he may be inspired. This propaganda must naturally derive an immense power from the theory of Marx which clears the way for the ideals of economic justice and economic freedom by an attempted "scientific" repudiation of all other ideals.

If today the workman wants to upset capitalism every where in the world, it is not so much on account of a desire for his own personal economic gain as for the sake of his ideal of economic justice which he wants to serve because it attracts him more than any other idea. Serving the ideal is itself a source of satisfaction for him. He loves not so much the economic gain that may come to him as a result of his revolutionary activities, if he survives them, but the justice that he hopes to establish in a part of the world through these activities, whether he survives them or not. As long as he desired only the economic gain his desire was never strong enough to turn him into a revolutionary. It was weighed down by his ideals. He does not so much envy the riches of the bourgeosie as he hates their injustice and greed. One proof of this is that he is not infrequently being helped by those rich people, who, as human beings, are being affected as much as the labourer by a propaganda which the Communist really intends for the latter.

The urge of self is the same in all human beings, whatever the economic class to which they may belong. We all love justice and hate injustice. The Communists' propaganda awakens in the labourer's heart a desire which he shares with all other human beings. The rich man who becomes conscious of justice and, therefore, helps the labourers had evidently to lose rather than to gain economically by a proletarian revolution. Yet he is bound to obey the urge of self in him because he becomes conscious of it; we are all bound to obey it, whenever we become conscious of it, whether we gain economically like the labourer or lose

economically like the rich man. Another proof is that the most highly cultured men throughout the world, irrespective of their classes, men, therefore, who are the nearest to the knowledge of beauty and who are the most qualified to understand it and love it are espousing the cause of the labourer. This is certainly not class-consciousness but self-consciousness.

Every workman knows that he is a workman. He is fully conscious of his class but it is possible that he may not be conscious of the injustice of the capitalist system because this system happens to be a part and a parcel of the ideal that he loves. Communism, as an ideal, cannot attract him unless he is able to shake off the love of his existing ideal. As long as Communism is not attractive enough for him to enable him to overcome the love of his existing ideal, he can never join the Communists. England, according to Marx, was the model of a country that was ripe for a Communist revolution even in his own days about a century ago but his forecast about England has yet to come out true and there is little possibility of its coming out true in the near future.

Certainly, one reason why the prophecy of Marx has proved to be wrong is that the English labourer loves his ideal of British Nationalism more than the ideal of Communism. He will not like to change his ideal of Nationalism for that of Communism. He will rather try to seek his economic rights constitutionally and in a manner which does not violate this ideal. The socialist philosopher ventured to make his forecast because he failed to see that it is the ideal that induces action, that economic considerations do not always count for everything and that the workers of England may, therefore, continue to find some ideal of a spiritual character far more attractive than some other, of an economic importance, which he expected them to love.

The fact that ideals (which include philosophical creeds) determine the social existence of men stares the

Communist philosophers in their face and they feel that they cannot ignore it, although they must also believe in the contrary dictum of Marx, which is the very foundation of Marxism, that the social existence of men determines their ideals. They are, therefore, confused and their confusion often results in illogical and conflicting statements. The following sentences occur in "A Test-Book of Marxist Philosophy."

"Man is *conditioned* but *not determined* by social structure and the stage of economic development".

"But the Russian knows that a man's creed matters, that it may be a *positive force* behind exploitation and parasitism and that you *cannot* destroy the social disease if you do not accompany your political and industrial measures with the refutation of capitalist philosophy and propagation of an *alternative*.... They know the fallacies of the system they repudiate and they have a system of their own to be *the master light* of *all* their seeing".

"This will occasion surprise in those who have always understood that the first principle of soviet philosophy was the economic determination of ideas. But although no creed comes into existence as a mere development of thought and out of all relation to social needs yet once a creed is born it has a force *of its own*. If it is believed, it will help to perpetuate the social system to which it belongs, if it is overthrown one of the butteresses of that system will be taken away. Therefore, the Russian is inclined to believe with Chesterton that the *practical* and *important* thing about a man is his view of the Universe".

"We think that for a landlady considering a lodger it is important to know his income but still more important to know his philosophy. We think that for a general about to fight an enemy it is important to know the enemy's numbers but still more important to know the enemy's philosophy".

"There has been no great movement in history that was not also a *philosophical* movement. The time of *big*

theories was the time of big results".

"It is indeed *impossible* to keep the mind free from philosophy. The man who says he is no philosopher is merely a bad philosopher". (*Italics are mine.*)

The admission that a man's creed may be a positive force behind exploitation, that the social disease cannot be eradicated unless the creed is destroyed, that a creed has an activity and a force of its own, that the practical and important thing about a man is his philosophy or view of the Universe, that every great movement in history was philosophical rather than economic, that big theories are the causes rather than the results of big events, that philosophy is unavoidable, is nothing if not a contradiction of the fundamentals of Marxism. It only means that the presence as well as the absence, the appearance as well as the disappearance of social disease, is determined by the philosophical creeds or the ideals of the society and that the creeds or the ideals must be changed in order that the economic conditions created by them may change. The statement that "no creed comes into existence as a mere development of thought and out of all relation to social needs", which is made side by side with all these emphatic pronouncements of the importance of creeds in determining social conditions, proves nothing to the contrary when we know (what we have already known) why and upto what extent really the birth of a new creed is connected with the prevailing social conditions.

Our creed determines the whole of our life, including our social conditions. When the creed is wrong, it creates wrong social conditions. These conditions are tested as wrong after a prolonged contact with them because they fail to satisfy our urge of self which is our internal criterion of right and wrong. When the conditions are discovered to be wrong, we come to know that the creed or the ideal determining them is also wrong. Therefore, in order to secure a fuller satisfaction of our urge for beauty, we change the creed first of all. The fact that a new, a better and a

more perfect ideal is suggested to us by the existing social conditions which we have judged as wrong is rather a proof that it is the ideal or the creed that determines the social conditions and not the social conditions that determine the creed or the ideal. The new creed comes into existence in order to take the place of the old wrong creed which had determined the old wrong conditions and the new creed is itself expected to determine the new conditions which we judge as right. *In each case* it is the creed that we *believe* to be the determining cause of social conditions. If on the other hand the social conditions had been the determining cause of the creed, we should have tried to change the conditions directly without bothering about the creed. But the fact that it is *impossible* to change the conditions without changing the creed is a proof that the creed determines or creates them. We change only the creed because we are convinced that the social conditions are only a part of it and that, when it is changed, the change of conditions will come automatically as a result of it.

The fundamental misunderstanding of Marx that it is the material life of men that determines their "consciousness" in addition to being incompatible with facts of human nature and human history implies that matter is the ultimate reality of the Universe. But recent advancements in the domain of Physics have led scientists to question seriously the validity of this hypothesis. These advancements have implications which point to consciousness rather than matter as the final reality of the world. The growing scientific knowledge of this century is, therefore, depriving Marxism of its foundations. Marxists, no doubt, still attempt to re-interpret the philosophy of their master with a view to reconciling it with the implications of modern Physics but their attempts which are concentrated mainly on belittling the significance of these discoveries are hardly successful. Marxism ignores the real character of the powerful unconscious urge of the human mind. We cannot stick to this creed for long because we desire much

more than mere economic well-being. The urge of our unconscious mind keeps us restless even when we have secured the full satisfaction of all our instinctive desires or material requirements. We shall have to discover the causes of this restlessness as well as the means of curing it. Supposing we have achieved a class-free society like that of the U.S.S.R. throughout the world. In what direction will the future evolution of such a society take place? Marxism has nothing important to say in answer to this question. The fact is that we evolve by striving continuously after Beauty or Perfection in obedience to the urge of our unconscious mind. The glorious future of man lies in unravelling the mysteries of the unconscious, and utilizing more and more of its unlimited powers.

It is a significant clue to the understanding of human nature that it has not been possible so far to curb the desire for religion entirely in Russia. This is so in spite of the fact that there is no struggle of classes in that country any longer and there is no necessity, therefore, to seek a "refuge" from the realities of life which is all that Marx understands religion to be. This is so, moreover, in spite of the fact that the authorities in Russia, if they are afraid of opposing religion directly, at least, discourage it as much as possible. The desire for religion so powerful, so irresistible and so inexplicable on any materialist hypothesis is due to the fact that the human self has a strong unconscious urge of attraction for the Divine Self which is the common ideal, the Right Ideal, of all men. All the gaity and beauty that we have been able to express in our life and the whole of the history of our race is due to our efforts to express this urge as much as possible.

Marxism, like every wrong ideal, contains the germs of its own dissolution and must break up sooner or later.

Chapter XI

EDUCATION AND ART

A correct theory of education can follow only a correct theory of the nature of man. According to the view of human nature maintained in this book, no theory of education will be correct unless it takes into congnizance the following facts :—

(1) A person is forced by the internal necessity of his nature to have some ideal of life always. Every ideal has a law of its own which the person is bound to follow on account of an inner pressure. All his actions, impulses and desires are controlled, guided and directed by the ideal that he has come to choose for the time being whether rightly or wrongly.

(2) Every system, programme or plan of education represents some ideal on which it is based. The text books, the mentality of the teacher, his attitude towards life generally, the views of the managing and governing authorities, whether they are public or private bodies, and the environment and the atmosphere of the school, in so far as they uphold that system, programme or plan of education reflect the ideal, which is, therefore, continually attracting the pupil towards itself. Education is a servant of ideals, whether wrong or right, and can be adapted to serve every one of them equally. All wrong ideals are due to a wrong education in a larger sense of the word. Education is an instrument which can be used with equal efficiency for better or for worse.

(3) Of all ideals there must be only one ideal that is correct. If we do not discover that correct deal and adapt our scheme of education to it, we shall be only moulding it

whether consciously or unconsciously to suit one of the innumerable wrong ideals and a wrong ideal will not induce any thing but wrong actions in the learner.

(4) The Right Ideal is the Ideal of the Self. It alone is capable of giving a permanent satisfaction to the individual and of inducing a genuine moral behaviour in him. It accords with the innermost desire of our nature and opens a vista of unlimited progress of self-consciousness. It is the ideal of the Universe itself. A wrong ideal has no value because it is unstable. We are bound to leave it behind and move forward to another ideal after some time. Moral behaviour in accordance with absolute and universal principles of morality is impossible without a strong love of the Right Ideal which it should be the object of education to create.

It is impossible to state a universal aim of education without defining the ideal of life. Some of the aims of education that have been suggested so far are as follows :— to form character, to prepare for a complete living, to produce a sound mind in a sound body, to bring out the best that is in man, etc. But all these statements are vague so long as we cannot define what is "a formed character," or "a complete living", or "a sound mind" or what is it that constitutes "the best" in man.

Sir T. P. Nunn, an eminent educationist of England, who has written one of the best known books on educational philosophy, points out the ambiguity of such statements and endeavours to raise himself above them by defining the aim of education as the free growth of individuality. But this definition is equally vague, since he does not tell us what the growth of individuality means or how the individuality can grow. We may enquire whether the individuality of an educated German, an educated Englishman and an educated Russian, fighting against each other, for example, in a war like the recent World War has grown equally or not. If it has grown equally, how is it that their ideas of morality and duty differ radically from each other? If not,

what factors have interfered with its growth in one case more than in the other?

Sir Percy Nunn realizes that we cannot define the aim of education without defining the ideal of life. The aim of education according to him must be the aim of life itself. One could, therefore, expect that he would suggest an ideal of life guiding the educator and pointing out the direction in which alone the individuality could grow freely. But that is not the case. He is opposed to having any ideal of life or of education at all except the ideal of freedom to have any ideal one likes. He writes :—

"....There can be no universal aim of education, if that aim is to include the assertion of any particular ideal of life for there are as many ideals as there are persons".

The writer takes this view evidently on account of his conviction that "the assertion of any particular ideal of life" or the adaptation of the educational scheme to a particular ideal is to interfere with the freedom of individuality and, therefore, with its growth. But is it possible to keep an educational system free from the influence of all ideals? We have held that it is not possible. Some ideal is being always taught to the pupil directly or indirectly. Even in the absence of a particular ideal purposely chosen by the educator we cannot be sure that the pupil's individuality has grown "freely". The child has to live in surroundings which are strongly charged with the influences of particular ideals and these influences have an unfailing, deep, though gradual and imperceptible, effect on the whole outlook of the child. The child continues to be influenced by such ideals by his teacher, his home, his school atmosphere, his country and the traditions of his nation. No educator can feel relieved of his duties by leaving the child to himself in the midst of such influences, which take the form of a refined and disguised compulsion or imposition on the child. If he does so, he has hardly given him freedom. But how can he check such influences unless he has a positive ideal to lay before his pupils? Education, we know, should

be a positive and not a negative process. "Do this" and not "Do not do this" is the proper attitude for the educator. Therefore we have to decide what particular ideal we should place before the pupil. It can be no other than the ideal of our nature which we have called the Perfect Ideal.

The difficulty of finding a suitable ideal cannot be solved by refusing to have any ideal. If we need a perfectly satisfactory ideal, we must discover it. There is no need in all nature but has the means of satisfaction. A need cannot persist for ever without being satisfied. When human nature is ultimately the same everywhere, why should there be as many ideals as there are persons? That there must be a single, perfectly satisfactory ideal for the whole of humanity, one can presume quite reasonably and scientifically. It is true that, when that ideal is agreed upon, every one will respond to it in one's own peculiar way. The manner in which each man will strive for it will depend upon his own peculiar inclinations and capacities. Since every individual is unique, the response of each to his ideal will be unique but that does not amount to saying that each man will have his own ideal. Fundamental unity is possible side by side with a diversity of details. Each of the one hundred sonnets written by one hundred different poets will be unique and different from every other, no doubt, but it is possible for these sonnets to have the same theme, the love of England, for example. If there is a fundamental diversity of ideals, it cannot but lead to strife and chaos in the world. If the individuality can grow equally along various and opposite lines, it passes one's comprehension what the growth of individuality can mean.

Sir Percy Nunn seems to think that any ideal is good enough provided it is voluntarily chosen, as if mere choice will work a miracle and change a bad ideal into a good one. If he had meant that a bad choice will be ultimately abandoned in favour of a good one so that no interference is necessary, it was perfectly intelligible. But evidently he does not mean that the educator can afford to leave the

pupil's life at the mercy of trials and errors. This is clear from the attitude that he adopts towards the moral education of children. He writes :—

"While, then, the unperverted impulses of childhood may have a biological bias towards the good it is too much to expect them to solve unaided the problems of life which have baffled some of the best intentioned minds and most highly gifted races of mankind. Beings, the deepest need of whose nature is creative expansion, must, therefore, on the whole, seek the good and cannot be satisfied unless they find it. But the tragic history of human consciousness and the sad story of what man has made of man show how doubtful is the search and how often it ends in disaster."

If, as the writer believes, the pupil stands in need of external help in the matter of moral education, we need to know in what direction that help will be given. Duty has a different meaning for different persons. Morality is a relative term and acquires its meaning from the ideal that it serves. It has a different meaning for persons of different ideals. What kind of morality should we teach the child? We cannot trust the ideal and the morality of the teacher to be always satisfactory. There may be as many ideals and as many systems of morality as there are teachers. Whatever direction the external aid for moral education may take, certainly, to employ that aid will amount to the "assertion" of a "particular ideal of life" which Sir Percy wants so much to avoid.

As the educator cannot escape the necessity of teaching a particular ideal to his pupils, he cannot escape the necessity of teaching the Right Ideal to them, if he is to assure that their individuality develops freely and safely from the influences of wrong ideals. Of course, like all ideals, the Right Ideal will have to be introduced to the child gradually, indirectly and in a manner which least interferes with his freedom and which taxes his understanding least of all.

Even in the case of ideals which are out of keeping with our nature the educator can arrange his educative

influences in such a way that the learner feels that he has accepted voluntarily and of his own free choice what may really be imposed upon him from outside. If we consider the opposition that Hitler and Lenin had to face in the earlier stages of the revolutions created by them in Germany and Russia and the subsequent radical transformation and conviction of the views of the masses in those countries in favour of their ideologies, we understand the power of education as an instrument of conversion. The ideals really imposed by these dictators on their subject populations became gradually a part and parcel of the being of every individual in the state. By means of education the people were made to reconcile themselves to a slavery which they abhorred in the beginning. No one understood in Germany just before the second World War and no one understands in Russia today that he and his nation have been enslaved through the magic of education. If education can convert people to wrong ideals, it can convert them much more easily to the Right Ideal which has not to be imposed from outside by the educator but the desire for which is ingrained in the nature of every person and has only to be awakened or stimulated by proper guidance and direction.

The Right Ideal is the only ideal which, when allowed to assert itself, will not interfere with the free growth of individuality. Rather it is the only ideal that can guarantee its free growth. This is the ideal of the innermost nature of man and its external teaching can be defended with a much greater force of the argument which Sir Percy Nunn employs to defend the external imposition of school discipline.

"Discipline", writes Sir Percy Nunn "is not an external thing but something that touches the inmost springs of conduct. It consists in the submission of one's impulses and powers to a regulation which imposes form upon their chaos and brings efficiency and economy where there would otherwise be ineffectiveness and waste... Its acceptance must on the whole be willing acceptance, the

spontaneous movement of a nature in which there is an inborn impulse towards greater perfection and expressiveness".

Education will hamper the free growth of individuality, if it subserves one of the ideals imposed from outside directly or indirectly, *e.g.* State, Nationalism, Communism, Democracy, National Socialism, etc. There is but one ideal towards which the individuality can move freely and that is the ideal of our own nature, the Right Ideal. We shall subserve outside ideals, or wrong ideals, we shall leave the child exposed to the direct or indirect influences of ideals which enslave the self, if we do not keep this ideal in view. Europe may not realize it at present but it is a fact that education in every European country, at this time, is intended to reconcile people to slavery of one kind or another.

ART

When we express Beauty in brick, stone, voice, sound, colour, word or movement, we call it the art of architecture, sculpture, singing, music, painting, poetry and dancing respectively.

Art is a part of the urge of self. Art, like other activities of the self, cannot be true to itself if it is inconsistent with the rest of the urge for Beauty. Beauty ceases to be Beauty, if it is divorced from Goodness and Truth. No attribute of Beauty can be separated from it. That art, whether it is poetry, painting, dancing, music or any other variety of it, which gives an immoral suggestion is not only immoral and degenerate, but is also low and worthless *as art*. Such an art is not the pure expression of self. Art gives a unique quality of pleasure, which is distinct from the pleasure derived from the satisfaction of any of the instincts. Such a pleasure can be derived only from an art which is pure and worthy of itself.

It does not mean that art should aim at morality. It cannot aim at anything. Like every activity of the self, it is a free expression of the self, unchained, spontaneous

and for its own sake. It should aim only at the expression or the love of Beauty and the love of Beauty is not the love of a part of it but of the whole of it. If art ignores Truth and Goodness, it is no longer an expression of Beauty and is therefore, no longer art.

Art is not a free expression of the urge of self and, therefore, not art at all, if it has not succeeded in making itself pure and free from all tinge of the immoral. But we also know that a thoroughly moral attitude is impossible without a strong love of the Divine Self. Of two artists of equal ability and merit we can expect an art of a higher standard from the one inspired by True Love.

Every activity of the self is the search for Beauty and, therefore, helps the progress or evolution of the self unless it ceases to be purely the self's own activity and becomes an activity of one of the instincts. Art is a search for Beauty; it is, therefore, a useful help to the evolution of self but unfortunately many a variety of art becomes easily an instrument of erotic pleasure, particularly dancing and singing. Such an art can be certainly purified and exalted but, if it may be difficult to do so, it will be in the interest of human progress to avoid it because it is no longer art but a form of sex-appeal. Whenever we are observing a demonstration of such an art, we need not deceive ourselves that we are enjoying art.

To a man of developed self-consciousness who has become familiar with that intoxicating joy which is derived from the contemplation of Beauty or the worship and adoration of Consciousness, the pleasure which most people derive from art looks insignificant. Such a person himself acquires a much greater pleasure from art than other persons since it revives for him the great joy of the expression of self with which he is already familiar as a worshipper. If such a man is an artist, his art reaches a standard of the highest perfection. Most people resort to art as the only refuge from the worries of life because they are not familiar with the joy attending an act of genuine and sincere worship. The

quality of pleasure derived from the activity of the self is the same whatever the nature of activity. The worship or adoration of Consciousness affords a much greater scope for the self's expression than art; therefore the pleasure one can derive from it is immense. This point can be hardly understood by people who have had no personal experience of the great joy of worship which is the good fortune of highly self-conscious persons alone.

Poetry is particularly injurious to mankind if it is inconsistent with the requirements of the Right Ideal. Then it passes on ugliness for Beauty. It puts a spoke in the wheel of human progress. It pictures death as life and attracts mankind towards it. It gives poison coated over with sugar. Sometimes its harm is incalculable, as it leads great masses of men into ultimate misery by directing their urge for beauty into wrong channels.

On the other hand, if poetry is consistent with Beauty, it is a great power for progress. All progress depends upon the expression of the urge of self and art helps the expression of this urge by making it active. Therefore all art, if it is worthy of itself, is an instrument of progress. But poetry is more so, on account of the fact that it can easily reach all, can be enjoyed at little expense and as often as one desires and also because it is more expressive and has the capacity to come intimately into contact with our daily life.

All expression and contemplation of Beauty is the activity of the self. Art is, therefore, an activity which is of the same category as worship or moral action and the pleasure derived from art is of the same character as that derived from prayers. Since art is a free expression of self, a slave or a man having a wrong ideal cannot be expected to produce art of the highest quality. It will be often no more than an imitation of nature or an expression of the tastes of the public whom it aspires to please. A slave is unable to create and invent with the whole of his natural capacity. As his self is not free, his capacities for creation and invention suffer from limitations and his art suffers

from a lack of originality. Art is an expression of Beauty and the source of all knowledge of Beauty is the self. If the artist is unable to express himself fully in his art, his art is not a free expression of Beauty and is, therefore, not art of the highest standard. The artist will be able to express himself fully and freely, if he is free from the love of all ideals that are foreign to the nature of self. Wrong ideals enslave the self and injure its capacity for the realization and expression of Beauty. The highest standard of art is possible only when the self of the artist is perfectly free.

Chapter XII

PROPHETHOOD AND EVOLUTION

In the chapter on Ethics we came to the conclusion that moral action, based as it must be on correct moral judgments, is not possible without a high degree of self-consciousness and a high degree of self-consciousness cannot be achieved without continued moral action for sometime. This state of things creates a problem for life which life must solve if it is to continue the process of evolution and it solves the problem by creating men who are known as "prophets". This state of things, moreover, is not unusual or peculiar to the psychological level of life. We have its analogy on the biological plane of life as well. It is like saying that a man cannot resist disease unless he is totally healthy and he cannot be totally healthy unless he resists disease continously for sometime. As in this latter case both good health and resistance to disease can be assured by the regular use of nourishing, vitalizing food, so in the former case, both a healthy self or (which is the same thing) a high stage of self-consciousness and moral action (resistance to immorality) can be assured by feeding the self regularly on the life-giving knowledge of a "prophet", that is, by offering strict obedience to him.

The term "prophet" is sometimes used to imply a man having a foresight. In the above paragraph, however, it is used in the sense of a man who rises to a very high stage of self-consciousness *by a special favour of nature* and becomes an inspired teacher and revealer of the will of the Creator. But how is it that nature favours some men to reach a very high standard of self-consciousness and become prophets and not the others?

The psychological phenomenon of prophethood is a continuation, in a different shape appropriate to the human stage of evolution, of the well-known biological phenomenon of mutations or sudden variations of species which nature manifested earlier at the animal stage of evolution. It is a characteristic of consciousness that resistance stimulates its activity. Whenever it feels that its movement is being retarded too much on account of these obstacles, it makes an extraordinary push forward and takes a sudden leap. Such efforts of consciousness resulted, in the animal world, in the sudden variations of species, *i.e.*, the sudden appearance, as if by miracle, of a type of species entirely different from and registering a considerable improvement upon the previous type. In the human world these efforts gave rise to the sudden appearance of highly self-conscious men whom we call prophets and who brought into existence, at various times in our history, some highly advanced and cultured societies in the world.

In the animal world the phenomenon of sudden variations of species came to an end with the appearance of the first man, that is, the first animal that was *biologically* complete enough to make possible the continuation of the process of evolution without the creation of any more species. One can assume that in the human world the corresponding phenomenon of prophethood must similarly come to an end with the appearance of the first prophet who is *psychologically* complete enough to make possible the continuation of the process of evolution without the creation of any more prophets, that is, with the appearance of the first prophet whose *practical life* is an application of the Right Ideal to all the fundamental aspects (*e.g.* to the social, ethical, legal, economic, military and political aspects) of natural human activity. Indeed the *life example* of such a prophet will embodiy all the essentials of that process by means of which life will be *actually* able to unfold and evolve itself and to realize its aspirations and actualize its potentialities in the future.

The extraordinary efforts of life, whether they manifest themselves in the animal world as sudden variations of species or in the human world as prophethood, are due to a feeling of restraint and constriction and the consequent necessity of a more vigorous self-expression on the part of life. In the animal world every such effort pushed forward the process of evolution by several stages but every effort failed to realize those highest possibilities of life which could be realized in the animal stage, except the effort that came last of all and resulted in the appearance of man, the perfect animal. When man had thus appeared, it took him a considerable time before he could dominate completely over the earth. In the human world every extraordinary effort of consciousness similarly carries forward the process of evolution by several steps but fails to realize all the highest aspirations of life possible to be realized in man except the effort that comes last of all. The first such effort that succeeds makes unnecessary, and puts a stop to, all future efforts of this kind. If the effort were not to fail each time, there would be no cause for it to be repeated. As soon as there is an effort which succeeds completely, it results in the appearance of a prophet who is a practical teacher of the Right Ideal in all its fundamental aspects, *i.e.*, whose life offers him full opportunities to set an example of how the human society of the future will act, struggle and expand in the actual course of evolution. The career of such a prophet represents a full expression of the latent possibilities of life. Such a prophet must, therefore, be the last link in the chain of prophethood, the last embodiment of the exceptional drives of consciousness in the human stage of evolution, as man was the last embodiment of the extraordinary leaps of consciousness in the animal stage. He is the *complete* as well as the *last* prophet. The reason is that in him life achieves a complete victory which it can never lose in future and never have to win again by creating another prophet. This victory is maintained and protected by life throughout in the form of a community

of the prophet's followers which endures and keeps alive by its existence his fundamental teachings till the end of the world. Such a community may be visited by terrible vicissitudes of fortune but nature can never allow it to perish, since it embodies an expression of the future hopes of life, a model of its future destination, rough in details, but complete and perfect in all its fundamentals.

Such a community can never disappear from the face of the earth because it represents what life wants to create and evolve and not what it wants to demolish and destroy. It upholds those principles of action which are in the very nature of life and by means of which life is bound to reach in actual fact its goal of evolution in future. Having taken refuge with life itself once for all, it becomes safe from death. Life sustains the community because the community sustains life and the community sustains life because life has realized itself completely in that community. Life on the one hand and the selves of the individuals forming the community on the other, respond to each other so completely that none likes to be separated from the other. Each has discovered itself in the other and, therefore, each has an unending charm for the other. In case one of them withdraws from the other, the other advances automatically and irresistibly to meet it. Such meetings of the two, following temporary separations, result in the appearance of highly self-conscious men within the community who maintain the general level of their self-consciousness, whenever it tends to lower.

This community is a complete victory of life and life, having once achieved a complete victory, maintains it throughout. It builds more and more upon previous victories of this kind and never loses them, since it has to go forward and not to come back. With such a community extant in the world, life never feels the constraint or the constriction which necessitates another extraordinary drive resulting in another prophet. In case there is another prophet after the last and the complete prophet,

nature does not require to favour him, as a moral and spiritual leader of men, with opportunities to emphasise by his example all the aspects of human activity which the process of evolution must reveal, because life has already succeeded in creating such opportunities in the case of one prophet in the past. His teachings as a practical leader of men, therefore, remain imperfect, one sided and incomplete and the community created by him also lives for but a short time unlike the community of the last and the complete prophet, which has the capacity to endure as long as the world lasts. Such a prophet can be only partially true and partial truth is no truth, as we know.

The attempt of life to bring prophethood to a finality or a completeness is not an extraordinary phenomenon peculiar to prophethood. It is the result of a general tendency of life. Life brings every creative process of its own to a finality and a completeness. When one finality or completeness is reached, the creative process changes in character and starts on a fresh career, of which this completeness becomes the foundation. Then the process advances by a series of steps for the achievement of the next higher finality or completeness. The creative process by which the next higher finality is reached has a course of evolution like the preceding process by which the previous finality was reached. The important point is that *a finality or a completeness that is once achieved is not dispensed with but is maintained and perpetuated as a necessary foundation of all subsequent evolution.*

To take an example, the human embryo in the womb of the mother develops from state to state till it achieves a completeness or a finality when it becomes fit to be born as a baby. The baby cannot live or grow after birth, if it does not achieve this finality before birth. In other words, nature makes this finality the foundation or the "first step" of the next process of growth, which starts as soon as the child is born and which takes an entirely new shape. The embryo is supplied with blood directly out of the blood of

the mother through the placental cord. It is a total parasite on the mother and depends for its life entirely on the healthy functioning of her bodily system. The baby on the other hand can live independently of the mother by virtue of that completeness of its growth and development which it was able to achieve during its embryonic stage in the womb of the mother. Its respiratory and digestive organs come into action and their activity imparts a new charcater to the process of its future growth. This process develops again step by step till, when the child attains to the prime of his youth, his teeth, his stature, his brain and other vital organs reach their perfection. The biological growth comes to a stop or continues only in minor details. This is a second finality or completeness which is built on the foundations of the first. This second completeness with all the powers (physical or mental) that it brings to the individual is utilized again as the basis of future evolution and becomes an essential and foundational material for that psychological growth which we understand as conscious and responsible action and effort for the achievement of the ideal. The process of evolution that was biological, now changes in character and becomes psychological. It now aims at a third finality or completeness of a different nature which consists of the highest evolution of the self. But here again it cannot proceed on its way unless it makes use of the second biological completeness *as a foundation.*

When we turn from the growth of the human individual to the growth of the Universe itself, we find the same principle at work.

The evolution of matter reaches a finality or a completeness when matter becomes ripe for the production of, and therefore actually produces, the first living cell. The evolutionary process, which was of a physico-chemical nature so far, changes in character and becomes vital or biological. It makes the initial physical completeness at its foundation and keeps on till it achieves another finality or completeness when the first complete animal or the first man

with a fully developed brain and the capacity to love ideals makes his appearance. The first completeness achieved in the form of the living cell figures as an indispensable part of this second completeness, since the human body is nothing but a huge conglomeration of living cells.

On the appearance of man the process of evolution again changes in character and shifts from the biological to the psychological or ideological plane where we find innumerable prophets emerging one after the other. Making this second finality or completeness its starting point, it continues its course for the achievement of a third finality or completeness in the form of the first complete prophet. This finality must form, as usual, an indispensable foundation of the next finality which will be, of course, a complete or a perfect Universe.

Thus we see that in the creative processes of nature there are series of finalities, wholes or completenesses. Every finality, whole or completeness is the culminating point of all the previous achievements of life. It is not merely their aggregate but an indivsible whole or a structure in which alone all these achievements can exist in their perfection, although some of them may be no longer recognizable in their new setting. Every completeness is, moreover, an indispensable foundation of the next and can be distinguished by its capacity to ensure the continuation of the altered process of future evolution. It alone, in exclusion to any of its constituents secured in the past, or their mere sum total, has the potentialities of future growth. It alone is the passage or the channel of future evolution. We, therefore, come to the conclusion, not only that prophethood comes to an ultimate completeness in some one prophet but also that the ideology and the life-example of that prophet froms an indispensable foundation of all the subsequent evolution of the human race. He alone is the gateway of all future evolution—*a gateway of evolution which, in the last resort, it is impossible for the human race to avoid*—and that is why life must exerts itself incessantly and

untiringly through the ages to make him appear.

When nature creates the first animal, that is, the first living cell, its real object is to create a complete animal or man and, when it creates the first complete animal or man, its object is to create a group or a community of hundreds of millions of animals like him, so that they may fill the whole earth and dominate it completely as the highest form of animal life. But when nature decides to do a thing, it is never in a hurry about it. It never fails in its ends and designs but it achieves them by a slow, gradual and systematic process.

When nature creates the first animal, it is confident that by exercising its instincts of self-preservation it will evolve itself further into higher and higher species, till man, the complete animal, will make his appearance. Whenever such evolution is retarded or stopped, life aids it by means of sudden drives resulting in the phenomenon which is known as "mutations" or sudden variations of species. Finally, when man comes into existence as a result of one of these drives, nature achieves its object that is implied in the creation of the first animal and, therefore, the creation of new species comes to a stop. Having brought the most perfect type of animal, man, into existence in this way, nature relies on the instincts of procreation in him and in his offspring as well as on their powers as the highest type of animal life to do for it the rest of its job, that is, to multply their numbers and to spread them throughout the earth.

Similarly, when nature creates the first prophet, its real object is to create a complete prophet and, when it creates a complete prophet, its object is to create not only a complete prophet but also a group or a community of hundreds of millions of his self-conscious followers in order that they may fill the whole earth. But here again nature proceeds to achieve its ends by a slow process. When the first prophet is created, nature is confident that the urge of consciousness in his followers will continue to evolve them

further till one day the first complete prophet with a complete ideology will make his appearance among them. Whenever such evolution is retarded or stopped, life helps it by sudden drives which result in the appearance of new prophets. Each drive of life results in a success but each success, like the one preceding it, is incomplete and, therefore, incapable of maintaining itself permanently or, what is the same thing, of evolving itself continuously. *Nature preserves, perpetuates or evolves only a complete success or the steps leading to it.* In other words, the ideology of none of the prophets that appear as a result of such drives has the capacity to satisfy the requirements of future evolution and, therefore, to endure for ever; none of these ideologies is complete and, therefore, none of them is capable of becoming the instrument or the foundation of future evolution.

The next drive takes place as often as the achievements of the last drive, instead of evolving themselves or adding to themselves continuously begin to give way, proving themselves unfit to cope with ever fresh obstacles in the way of life as manifested in them. Because they are incomplete, their ultimate decline or dissipation is inherent in their very nature. The occasion for the next drive (which, of course, aims once again at producing a complete prophet) becomes ripe every time that the ideolcgy of the prophet who comes into existence as a result of the last drive, proves itself to be incomplete and unfit to hold its own and evolve itself further for its very life in the midst of ever-changing hostile circumstances. Finally, when the complete prophet comes into the world as a result of one of these drives, nature achieves its object that is implied in the creation of the first prophet and the creation of new prophets, as leaders of new communities, comes to a stop. Having brought the most perfect type of prophet into existence in this way nature relies upon the urge of leadership in him and in his followers as well as upon their powers as the embodiment of the highest expression of life, to do for it the rest of its job, that is, to multiply their numbers

and to spread them throughout the earth.

To say that every prophet who comes before the last prophet is necessarily incomplete, does not mean that his knowledge of self is incomplete as compared with that of the last prophet. It only means that the conditions of the society in which he appears and the circumstances which he has to face are such that only a small portion of his knowledge of self, which is, in fact, always as complete as that of any other prophet, before him or after him, is able to have expression in his precept as well as in the personal example of his life in which it is ultimately embodied. The circumstances in which he appears are such that he is able to give us only an incomplete view of life. A prophet's knowledge becomes manifest and actual only in the course of his reaction to circumstances. It is like two men having each a sum of Rs. 1,000 at his credit in the bank, of whom one spends only Rs. 100 during a month and the other spends the whole amount. The latter will appear to us to be richer than the former, although, as a matter of fact, both are equally rich. It is when and because a prophet is unable to give us a perfect view of life that nature requires to repeat the experiment of prophethood. Although the knowledge of no prophet preceding the last prophet is incomplete, yet the ideology of each one of them, *as embodied in the example of his own practical life*, is incomplete on account of the circumstances in which he comes to live his life. Of all the prophets the last prophet alone gives a complete ideology to the world, an ideology, which, as reflected in his practical life, embraces all aspects of human nature, and that is why he becomes the last prophet.

This does not mean that of the series of efforts that consciousness makes in order to produce a complete prophet only one—the last of all—succeeds and all others go waste or fail completely. The result of every effort that comes next are higher in some way than those of the previous one because every effort aims not only at compensating for the loss of the achievements of the previous effort

but also at adding to those achievements in such a way that their total result is a complete prophethood. In other words, it wants to compensate for the lack of that progress which would have been possible if the ideology of the previous prophet had had the capacity to and had continued to evolve itself into a full-blown ideology. The result of every effort is what it is because the previous effort had taken place. These drives of consciousness, therefore, assume the shape of a process of building on the past successes for the achievement of a final complete success. The last effort secures results which include all the previous successes plus something more to make a complete systematic whole or a configuration, a pattern or a structure in which the past successes exist in their perfection, whether or not it is possible for us to recognize the min this structure. This whole may be different from its constituents, as they display themselves in the past, in certain things, but it is their creative continuation and not their denial. The last effort of life, as a result of which this whole comes into existence, substracts nothing from the previous results but rather adds to them and their apparently altered character in the final whole is due to this addition rather than to any substraction. Thus the teachings of the last prophet, *the final whole of prophethood*, which nature creates by its repeated efforts includes the teachings of all the previous prophets, whether it may be possible for us to recognise them in his teachings or not.

Every incomplete ideology, that is, the ideology of every prophet preceding the last prophet, succumbs to the forces of evolution and is effaced by them completely in the long run because nature does not care for the parts of a whole, however good and beautiful they may be in themselves, unless they are in the whole in which they are meant to exist. Nature wants to create wholes and, when it succeeds in creating them, it preserves them and uses them as the basis of future evolution or rather they preserve themselves and persist and evolve because as wholes they

acquire powers, properties or potentialities which enable them to persist and evolve. When a product of creation which was intended by nature to be a whole fails to be one, it is allowed to perish with every thing good and beautiful that may be there in it, not because nature wants to destroy what is good and beautiful but because it wants to preserve it where alone it can be best preserved, that is, in its complete setting within a complete whole. In other words, after discarding the incomplete product nature makes a fresh attempt to create the intended complete whcle, where the discarded product comes to live again, and permannetly. In one sense, therefore, none of the ideologies of the old prophets are swept away completely. Each lives in its perfectly developed condition in the form of the complete ideology of the last prophet. Each finds its full expression and realizes its destiny in the ideology of the last prophet. The ideology of the complete prophet, of course, as reflected in his actual practical life, embraces all aspects of human nature and thus, being a complete whole, is in favour with the forces of evolution and has the powers and the potentialities to endure for ever.

A prophet was defined above as a person who is gifted with a high standard of self-consciousness *by a special favour of nature*. But nature's gift of prophethood is not a favour to one man; it is meant to be, and it is, a favour to those innumerable men in every generation, who attain to a high standard of self-consciousness by accepting his guidance and leadership. Although the essential quality in prophethood is a high degree of self-consciousness which the follower of a prophet may also nearly achieve yet *the difference between a prophet and his highly self-conscious follower is great and fundamental* It is similar to the difference between a man who has visited a city and seen every nook and corner of it himself and a man who has only listened to its description from him and visualized every nook and corner of it. Or, it is similar to the difference between the inventor of a highly complicated machine

and a man who has been only trained to use it efficiently. The latter can never attain to the high standard of the knowledge and skill of the former. The self-consciousness of the prophet is of a standard and quality which can never be achieved by any of his followers and which remains for them an ideal to be realized till the end of the world. The reason is that the follower of a prophet, however much he may evolve his self-consciousness, can yet never become a prophet.

A prophet is blessed with a high level of self-consciousness independently of all external guidance while his follower acquires it by virtue of his absolute obedience to him. The leader creates values which are unknown to the follower and which the follower realizes and acquires by means of only his absolute obedience to the leader. The prophet leads other men on behalf of consciousness. The follower leads other men on behalf of the prophet and creates not his own followers but the followers of his leader. The leader achieves a high standard of self-consciousness as the sole result of a sudden drive of consciousness aided by his own urge for beauty. The follower achieves it by a long, difficult and laborious process which is not free from temporary and occasional slips and errors, at least in the beginning. The former can appear only when circumstances favouring a special drive of consciousness are present, while the latter can acquire self-consciousness under all circumstances, provided he can avail himself of the life-example of his prophet. The former may be compared to a man who is raised to the top-floor of a high building suddenly by an electric lift and the latter to a man who struggles towards it step by step along a stair-case.

Self-consciousness is in the nature of man which is permanent and which man will know how to express more and more in future. Every man is potentially self-conscious and waits to become actually self-conscious sooner or later. Self-consciousness, therefore does not come to an end with the appearance of the complete prophet; it

rather blossoms forth more and more abundantly and self-conscious men appear more and more numerously after he has come into the world. Only, no one of these men is, by the very nature of things, able to discover himself in a position to become a new centre of a partial or total spiritual authority or to create an independent society of his followers by assuming the title of a prophet. The reason is that, with the community of the complete prophet extant in the world, the cause of the sudden drives of consciousness outside the prophet's community disappears and the drives come to a stop, having become both unnecessary and impossible. The result is that no man, who is not a follower of the complete prophet, is able to rise to the higher stages of self-consciousness. The title of aprophet, in all its varieties, implying a wholly or partially authoritative and independent spiritual leader, becomes, therefore, the prerogative of the complete prophet which neither any one of his innumerable and ever-increasing self-conscious followers nor any one besides them, ever has reason to share. What comes to an end most naturally and necessarily after the appearance of the complete prophet is not the principle or the quality of self-consciousness, which exists enfolded in the nature of man and which must be unfolded increasingly in the future but rather *the formation of new communities under new prophets.* This provision of nature is extremely important, since it makes possible that permanent unity of the human race, essential for their continued evolution, which only the leadership of a single man can assure.

Every prophet who comes into the world leaves behind him a community of his followers who, in spite of their pretensions to an all-embracing love and cosmopolitanism, quite naturally, believe in him and nobody else. This process highly subversive of human unity cannot continue for ever. Consciousness cannot go on always dividing humanity into an increasing number of highly prejudiced, narrow-minded and dissenting communities. Its real and

ultimate intention in creating one prophet after another is not to divide mankind more and more, as this is contrary to its very nature, but it is rather to provide for its ultimate unity on the basis of a single complete ideology taught by a single prophet; and, like all its other intentions, consciousness does not fail to realize this intention of its own sooner or later. That the ultimate unity of the human race is essential and inevitable follows from the very nature of consciousness which, in spite of the diversity of its creation, is one and seeks oneness.

Every extraordinary effort of consciousness which results in the appearance of a new prophet aims at creating, through him, a community which is able to exemplify, as perfectly at least as essential, how the future, actual, conscious evolution of humanity, that is, the future practical and conscious achievement of the Right Ideal by the whole of the human race can and will proceed. In other words, very far from aiming at subdividing humanity, consciousness aims at creating, through one of its sudden efforts, a *community* which enjoys a standard of life and a stage of evolution, by virtue of which it is best fitted, not only to rise to higher and higher levels of evolution itself but also to absorb gradually all the other communities and thereby to unite the whole of humanity within its body. The ideology of this community provides for the unlimited evolution of mankind and endures for ever, since it embraces all the fundamental aspects of human nature. Consciousness is in search of such a community and respeats its effort only when such a community has failed to appear, that is, when the ideology of the last community created by it has failed to hold its own on account of its inherent shortcomings. When consciousness repeats its effort, a new prophet and a new community comes into existence. But whether or not the new effort results in the last prophet and the last community depends on the fact whether or not the circumstances in which the prophet comes to live his life are, this time, such as to favour the basic intention of consciousness

involved in the effort. If they prove favourable, he and his community are able to exemplify completely the process of future evolution; consciousness succeeds in its purpose and does not require and ceases to create new prophets and new communities for the future. It then, rather waits for this final community (since the community continues to live for ever) not only to rise to higher and higher levels of evolution itself but also to absorb all the other communities into itself and thereby to fulfil its purpose of uniting the whole of the human race on the basis of the Right Ideal. In this way, all the ideologies of the past disappear visibly, but, as a matter of fact, they do not disappear; they continue to live, having reached their perfection and their ultimate goal in the Final Ideology.

Man, as a self-evolving being, must be left at some stage of his evolution to make further discoveries about himself without fresh assistance from outside and that stage is reached as soon as the complete prophet has come into the world, that is, as soon as all the assistance that is essential as the *foundation* or the *seed* of such a progress becomes available to him for the first time. Then is man able to rely upon such assistance permanently without prejudice to the possibilities of his continued evolution of the future.

Supposing the ideology of one of the prophets is so complete that it has the potentialities of uniting the whole of the human race on the basis of the Right Ideal and actually succeeds in uniting them into a single family. Then, if the coming of prophets as the propagators of new ideologies and the founders of new communities, with new names and designations, should never come to a stop, as a principle, consciousness will create another prophet who will again slice off a portion of humanity to be his followers and then another one and another one *ad infinitum* with similar consequences in each case. In this way, consciousness will do no more than tear to pieces a unity which mankind was able to win after thousands of years of hard and bloody struggle. In this way, it will not only lose entirely

its accumulated victories of the past but will also act contrary to the urge of its own nature. This is evidently an absurd conclusion! We must, therefore, infer that the finality of prophethood, in the sense in which we should understand it, is a fact and is indispensable to the ultimate unity as well as to the continued evolution of the human race.

The last of the prophets, whenever he comes into the world, is the first as well as the last of them. He is the first because he is the first to satisfy completly the requirements of life as a *specimen* to be followed by humanity for the sake of their continuous evolution of the future. All the prophets of the past live in him again. And he is the last of the prophets because he is that last type of life on the psychological plane which nature intends to spread to the whole world and after which no fresh types on that plane are needed or created. He is the prophet of the past as well as the prophet of the future. The first complete prophet is the final prophet in the sense in which the first complete animal (man) is the final animal, that is, as a type of life and not as an individual of a type. In other words, he is the last prophet who really needs to found a community of his followers and whose community is really needed by life. For these reasons we shall refer to him in the pages that follow as the Complete or the Last prophet or only as the Prophet and to his revelation as the Prophet's Book or only as the Book.

When man came into the world, he procreated and spread throughout the earth gradually on account of his superiority over the lower animals till, in the course of millions of years, the whole of the earth was filled with his offspring. Since the first human being was a type of life that represented a complete animal, life favoured it and helped it to prosper, to multiply and to dominate the earth. As, after the appearance of man, the first complete animal, the world is gradually filled with a race of men, so, after the appearance of the first Complete Prophet, the world is gradually filled with a race of his self-conscious followers.

The ideology of the Complete Prophet obtains a victory over all the other ideologies gradually on account of its superiority over them as a higher type of life.

The complete animal, man, spread throughout the earth because he procreated. The procreation of the complete animal is biological. The procreation of the complete prophet, as a prophet, is psychological. On the biological level the achievements of life are disseminated and spread from one organism to another by means of the urge of sex. On the psychological level they are transmitted and spread from one man to another by means of the urge of leadership, which includes the urge to obey. Leading and obeying, although opposite in character, are (like the urge of sex in the opposite sexes) two aspects of the same urge *to transmit the wave of life*. This urge is a part of the urge of consciousness and the instinct of sex is only a lower expression of it. Leading and obeying on the psychological level of life are similar to the union of the opposite sexes on the biological plane of life. As an organism begets an organism, so an idea begets an idea. Men who will be inspired by the Prophet will make his ideal their own and will thereby constitute his psychological offspring which will go on multiplying and spreading throughout the earth. As the biological offspring of man enjoys a superiority over the other animals on account of which it is able to dominate the earth completely at last, so the psychological offspring of the Complete Prophet enjoys a superiority over the rest of mankind by means of which it is able to dominate them completely in the long run. As the present race of men required a first man to be their progenitor, so the future race of highly self-conscious men needs a first self-conscious man of the same type, *i.e.*, a prophet, to be their spiritual grandfather.

To be the psychological offspring of the last and the Perfect Prophet will be a dignity, a privilege, a pride as well as a promise to rule the world. But it will be necessary for those who wish to share this dignity, this privilege, this

pride and promise, to place their utter reliance on the Prophet and to obey him *totally* and *without a question*. Obedience, faith and loyalty are aspects of love. They will have to love him, therefore, with all the love of which they are capable, better than they love the parents of their physical body. They will have to depend upon him completely as an embryo depends upon the mother in her womb. It is only in this way that they will be born of him psychologically and will come to deserve the privileges that will belong to his psychological "offspring". Their love of the Prophet will not be unnatural or artificial. The Prophet's love is already a part of the nature of every man, since our urge for Beauty demands a human leader or teacher to guide its satisfaction. By loving the Prophet, therefore, they will be only giving expression to an urge of their own nature. Whenever we love a human leader, whether he is a king or a dictator or a prophet or any other person, we use or misuse this love according as the leader is a true or a false, a complete or an incomplete representative of Consciousness. Everybody has a leader whom he loves and, therefore, everybody is making use of the love which is meant really and ultimately for the only human leader of men, that is, for the First as well as the Last of the prophets.

There is no doubt that the fundamental urge of human consciousness is to love the Creator and nobody else. But a love is always a system of loves; we love every object that brings us nearer to the beloved. The love of the Creator must manifest itself in the form of innumerable subservient loves and the most immediate and obvious form of subservient love in which it can manifest itself is the love of the Prophet which is an indispensable condition for the birth and the growth of the love of the Creator. The Prophet, as the parent of the higher life of man, has a greater right to his love and obedience than the mother, the person to whom an individual owes the birth and the growth of his physical body. In fact the Prophet has not merely a right to our love but our nature, provided it is

correctly guided, compels us to love him more than we love our parents. Moreover, if we love and obey him, we shall do so only in our own interest. By loving the Prophet we shall grow our love for the Creator, give expression to the urge of our consciousness and evolve ourselves and, as our love for the Creator will grow in this way, it will add further to our love for the Prophet. The growth of the Prophet's love will be at once the cause and the result of the growth of the love of the Creator. Since the love of the Prophet will arise in the service of the love of the Creator, as a part of human nature, the two loves will grow simultaneously; by growing the one we shall grow the other.

Those who will submit themselves completely to the orders of the Prophet in accordance with the demand of their nature will, so to say, take a new birth, and will start a new career of growth. By their complete submission to him they will feed themselves on the vitalizing milk of his knowledge and will grow and evolve their self, as a baby feeds on the nourishing milk of the mother and grows and evolves his body.

When a child sucks the nipples of his mother's breasts, he simply acquires a support, a stimulus or a spur for that urge to grow and evolve which is already latent in his nature. This urge is strengthened as the child grows so that he is able to look after himself more and more and requires less and less assistance from the mother. Before long the child comes to know that his own body, strengthened by the milk of the mother, can manage to supply him with the nourishment that he got from her body. He becomes independent of the mother. The mother is happy that the child has grown and has learnt to grow further and the child is happy that he is satisfying more and more of those hopes and desires which the mother entertained when she fed him and which were implied in her act of feeding. A time comes when the child feels that he has grown as strong and healthy as his parent. But although the child becomes independent of the mother in one way, he is not at

all independent of her in an other way. The nourishment that he got from the milk of the mother enters into all his future nourishment. It is the seed from which all his future nourishment is growing. Thus even the biological relation between the mother and the son, the mother as the nourisher and the son as the recipient of nourishment is a permanent one. In the same way, though the follower of the Prophet may become nearly as self-conscious as his master in due course of time on account of his unqualified and utter obedience to him, the psychological relationship between the two, one as the leader and the other as the follower, can never come to an end.

The book of the Prophet, of which the Prophet himself, that is, his practical life, becomes the explanation or the commentary, is a simple, easily digestible mental food, as the milk of the mother is for a baby, because it is required primarily to feed and nourish men at a very low level of self-consciousness, men who are mere babies as regards their self-knowledge. But as a spiritual food, it has the potentialities of rearing giants of spiritual power, as the milk of the mother, in spite of its simplicity as a diet, has the potentialities of rearing giants of physical power. It possesses all the spiritual "vitamins" essential for the growth of self and it is, therefore, equally suitable and adequate as a food for a man who is a "child" and a man who is a "full-grown youth" as regards his self-consciousness; in other words, it is suitable and adequate as a spiritual food at all stages of the growth of self. The man who submits himself completely to the orders of the Prophet at once puts himself in a position to drink from his knowledge and thereby to grow and evolve his self indefinitely.

If the end of an individual's progress is the achievement of the highest self-consciousness, it must have a beginning and the beginning is made as soon as the individual surrenders himself totally to the authority of the Prophet. Birth and growth on the psychological level of life are very much similar to birth and growth on the biological level.

Every grown up man must begin as a child and every child must have a father. He who gives himself up to the unqualified obedience of the Prophet, takes a new birth which is the birth of his self-consciousness and, as his physical body has a course of growth from his birth to the prime of his youth, so his self-consciousness too has a course of growth from the moment it takes its birth till the end of his life. It continues to evolve bit by bit till it reaches the stage of its highest evolution, where the man discovers at last that the commands of the Prophet which he was carrying out with absolute submission and humility are not external to him but they are his real, internal desires which he, at his best, cannot but love to follow of his own free choice.

Having discovered his nature in this way, he finds as if he can go the rest of his path himself almost without depending upon the Prophet any longer. But in spite of it, there is nothing in his life to show that he has become independent of the Prophet. The reason is that the path of life which has become visible to him now and which he is impelled to follow by the urge of his own nature is no other than the path of the Prophet himself. He still follows in the footsteps of the Prophet but now he does so without effort, automatically and even irresistibly. His complete dependence upon the Prophet has awakened and given a spur or a stimulus to that urge to grow and evolve his self-consciousness which was latent in his nature. Although he can never attain to that standard of self-consciousness which is enjoyed by the Prophet, yet there is a stage in his development when he feels that he is drawing very close to that standard. But even at this stage he does not abandon the path of the Prophet, not only because he obeys him in spite of himself but also because he knows that the road to the highest stages of self-consciousness which he now follows out of his own irresistible desire is, even in the minutest of details, no other than the way prescribed by the Prophet. Such a man is the true "descendant," of the

Prophet. He is similar to him psychologically in belief and action as the son is similar to the father in form and features. He is the Prophet's offspring by a psychological "birth".

A prophet is the progenitor of a psychological type of life just as the first individual of every species, whenever he comes into existence, is the progenitor of a biological type of life. The biological types continue to evolve till they end with the appearance of the first complete animal *i.e.*, the first human individual. The psychological types similarly continue to evolve till they end with the appearance of the first complete prophet. As there was the last and the most perfect of species or the biological types of life, so there is the last and the most perfect of prophets or the psychological types of life.

This means not only that the ideology of the Last Prophet alone will bring about and perpetuate the unity of the human race but also that it alone will carry them forward to the stage of their highest evolution. This means further that *evolution to the highest levels of self-consciousness by means of worship and moral action will be possible only for the followers of the Last Prophet and not for those of any other prophet.* At the animal stage evolution took place along one line alone and it was that which was leading to the emergence and earth-domination of the last of the natural species *i.e.* man. Similarly at the human stage, evolution continues along one route alone and it is that which leads to the emergence and world domination of the last of the natural ideological communities, *i.e.*, the community of the Last Prophet.

We have already known that evolution depends not only on the efforts of the creatures to evolve themselves but also on the response of Reality to these efforts in view of the general scheme of things inherent in the Universe, that is to say, on the latent possibilities or potentialities of life. This is what happened at the animal stage of evolution. That is why all the species, in spite of their best efforts to exist and, therefore, to evolve themselves into higher and

more complicated forms by their struggle for existence, could not continue their evolution and could not turn into the human form of life. This is what must happen at the human stage of evolution. People belonging to an ideological community other than that of the Last Prophet may also resort to worship and moral action. Yet Reality will never bless their efforts with good results and will not evolve them towards higher stages of evolution so long as they do not enter the community of the Last Prophet and do not offer strict obedience to him. Nature helps and favours only those species and those ideological communities which help and favour its own objectives and aspirations.

Some thinkers have proposed the creation of a new religion by combining all the religions as a device for the unification of mankind. But apart from the fact that it is impossible to put such a scheme into practice, humanity can never be convinced and, therefore, inspired and evolved to the highest stages of love by any eclectic, artificial or man-made religion. It is only a natural religion infused with life and vigour by the personal example of a prophet-founder and claimed and believed to be the direct revelation of the Creator which can create a genuine faith or a sincere love in their hearts. Even if a consciously planned eclectic religion comes into existence and succeeds in creating a community of its followers, the community must lack the capacity to endure. After some time it must begin to shrink in numbers till it is wiped out entirely. As a crossbred animal cannot continue its race for long so a crossbred ideology cannot continue to have its followers beyond a certain limit. Every unnatural non-prophetic ideology, whether religious, political or intellectual, created by a spiritual man, a political leader or a thinker, in disregard of the prophetic ideology in force at the time, belongs to the same category. It is an unconscious, eclectical fusion of the founder's own ideas with some of the ideas of the prophets. Such are, for example, the ideologies of Communism,

Fascism and National Socialism and in fact all wrong ideologies.

Unless we submit totally to the guidance of a *particular* prophet who should be the prophet of the age, we cannot evolve our self-consciousness as individuals and as a society. As heat flows from one body to another that may be in contact with it and as a candle lights another candle held close to its flame, so the light of love or self-consciousness is kindled in a person who establishes, by virtue of his beliefs and actions, a psychological contact with another person who is at a high stage of self-consciousness. The light of love concentrates itself first of all at one point and from there its rays spread far and wide over the earth. That point is always the personality of a prophet. As we cannot have a child without a father, so we cannot have a self-conscious man without a prophet.

Although the outward form of natural ideologies has been changing from time to time, it will be wrong to suppose that the eternal or essential part of any of them is only its moral essence or the principles of universal ethics that underlie its teachings or that, for this reason, the outward form of the last of these ideologies will, after sometime, be ignored in favour of its essence or subjected to endless alterations at the discretion of its followers. Such a view can be only due to a mis-understanding that the forms of natural ideologies have been only *changing* and not *evolving* towards a stage of perfection or to a misunderstanding that a definite external form is not indispensable to the existence of a natural ideology and that, in any case, a natural ideology remains the same, no matter how its form may be changed. These misunderstandings are in their turn, due to an erroneous view of the qualities and characteristics of life as they manifest themselves at the biological and psychological planes of evolution.

As a matter of fact a definite external form is as essential to the existence of an ideology as a definite physical form is essential to the life of an organism. As a human being

consists of the spirit plus the physical body so an ideology consists of its moral or spiritual essence plus its external form. A type of life, whether biological or psychological, can exist, act and function in this external, objective world only as a whole consisting of the form plus the essence or it cannot exist, act or function at all.

All evolution whether it takes place at the biological or the psychological level is essentially the evolution of forms and the forms are as unalterable at the psychological level as they are at the biological level. The essence of all organisms at the biological stage of evolution is the same *viz.*, consciousness as an *urge to live* a life of the highest efficiency, yet the urge to live achieved its most perfect expression in a particular biological form which is man. Similarly, the essence of all ideologies at the psychological stage of evolution is the same *viz.*, consciousness as an *urge to love* an ideal of the highest beauty. Yet, the urge to love achieves its most perfect and expression in a particular ideological form which is the Ideology of the Last Prophet. This form is unchangeable like the physical form of the human being. An ideology without a *definite* and *permanent* external form is as dead and lifeless as an organism without its physical body.

As every natural species has a set of inherited physical features which characterise it and distinguish it from other species, so every natural ideological community (*i.e.*, a community following a natural or prophetic ideology) has a set of inherited ideological features which characterise it and distinguish it from other such communities. These ideological features consist of the particular forms of worship and religious institutions practised by the prophet and his immediate followers. As there is a biological heredity operating at the animal level of evolution, so there is a psychological heredity working at the human level of evolution. Biological heredity stamps a particular physical form upon a species, separates it from all other species and gives it a continuity in time and thus makes possible the

final emergence of a species of the most perfect physical form. Similarly psychological heredity imparts a particular ideological form to a community, isolates it from all other ideological communities and gives it a continuity in time and thus makes possible the ultimate emergence of a community of the most perfect ideological form. A species cannot alter its physical features radically without changing into a new species. In the same way an ideological community cannot change its ideological features without becoming a new ideological community. A species outgrows its physical features only when by a sudden drive of consciousness there occurs a mutation and a new species comes into existence. This process we know has ended with the emergence of man. Hence man will continue to have his present physical form and features till the end of the world and there will be no higher species to replace him. Similarly a natural ideological community outgrows its ideological form and features only when a sudden drive of consciousness gives rise to a new prophet and a new community. This process comes to an end with the emergence of the Last Prophet and his community. Hence the original forms of worship and religious institutions of the ideology of the Last Prophet must continue to be a part and parcel of it till the end of the world. These forms and institutions cannot hinder but must rather safeguard and guarantee the continued evolution of mankind in view of their perfect harmony with the creative urge of the Universe and their being in special favour with the forces of evolution.

These facts point to the conclusion that no alteration of any of the institutions of a natural ideology, even with the intention of improving it, is possible, simply because the altered or improved ideology, however wisely it may have been improved or altered, will be worthless for the purposes of evolution. It is neither accidental nor meaningless that a natural ideology (*i.e.*, a prophetic religion) has an unconquerable tendency to persist in the form in which it was left by its founder. It is due to a tendency

which is in the very nature of life. *Whatever form life takes in its nascent condition—whatever the apparent causes and conditions that may have enabled it to take that from—becomes fixed for ever.* This is true as much of the forms and institutions of a newly emerging natural ideology at the psychological stage of evolution as it is of the form and features of a newly born organism or a newly emerging natural species at the biological stage of evolution. As long as a religion lives, its followers resist heresy and innovation with all the power that they command. It may be totally abandoned by its followers, in case it is unable to satisfy the requirements of evolution at any stage of the life of the community, but it is never allowed by them to get mixed up or associated with any beliefs and actions which did not form a part of it in the beginning. Such a demand is in the very nature of man and is a part of his urge for Beauty. It is the individuals' response to the desire for Reality within him. That is why Reality responds to and evolves only an individual who follows a religion created and enforced at the time by Reality itself. It is this aspect of human nature which guarantees the continued preservation of the last of the natural ideologies and thereby the creation and maintenance of a permanent unity of the human race on its basis.

In case we decide not to follow a particular prophet and to follow only the general principles of the teachings of all the prophets, we shall not be able to follow the teachings of any of them. We shall leave religious principles to the judgment of the individual who may put upon them any interpretation he likes and may choose any combination of them, making freely his own additions and subtractions. As such judgments of individuals, who have necessarily to remain at the earliest stages of self-consciousness under such conditions, are bound to be extremely faulty, they give rise to an infinite variety of wrong and conflicting views of the needs and requirements of the Right Ideal which means a large number of con-

flicting religions. Such individuals can never constitute a homogeneous society and can never organize themselves into a state founded on the Right Ideal. In other words, in their case, the Right Ideal is not able to acquire a political realization and thus ceases to be the Right Ideal. A society of such individuals can never expand to unify the whole of mankind as a world-state based on the Right Ideal. Even if we have an eclectic religion planned to be the political ideal of a society by a council of wise men—supposing such a difficult planning is carried to a successful conclusion—it will be unable to inspire but will, on the other hand, be highly suspected and inwardly despised. It will not be able to play the role for which religion is really intended.

Obedience to general ethical principles taught by all the prophets is not possible for any human individual without his direct and personal contact with Reality which should be deep and intimate enough to inspire, control and determine all his activities and this contact can become deep or intimate only by offering strict obedience to the prophet of the age. This is the greatest and the most fundamental of all the laws of human nature and moral principles which constitute the common factor of the teachings of the prophets. In the absence of it all the other principles taught by them are, in practice, reduced to nothing.

With the community of the Last Prophet extant in the world, the need for the sudden drives of consciousness outside the community disappears but it continues to exist within the community itself. Having succeeded once in creating a complete prophet, consciousness counts upon the community of his followers to pass on the wave of life gradually to the whole of mankind, as the Prophet himself had passed it on to them. Consciousness makes every complete success achieved by it a stepping stone or an instrument for the next higher success. The community of the Last Prophet is, therefore, an indispensable instrument for the evolution of the whole of mankind. *Consciousness makes this community a channel or a passage through which alone life*

flows down to the whole of the human race. This community is, therefore, the centre of the hopes of consciousness for the achievement of all the rest of the objectives of evolution. Consciousness tries to maintain the community's level of self-consciousness not only because it is impelled by its nature to preserve a hard-won and full-fledged victory of the past but also because it is a necessary condition of the future evolution of the whole of humanity. The highest level of self-consciousness in the community is also the highest level of self-consciousness in the whole of humanity and, therefore, by maintaining the former it also maintains the latter.

The community of the Prophet expands like every other ideal-group. It encroaches more and more upon the world of wrong ideals beyond itself not only by absorbing men who are willing to enter it but also by exerting an unconscious and indirect influence in favour of certain aspects of the Prophet's ideology on the rest of humanity, that is, on men who are unwilling to enter it. Influences of the Prophet's ideology in the form of ideas, continue to pour slowly and imperceptibly into the mental world of humanity at large, shifting their ideals more and more towards the Right Ideal. These influences are accepted and absorbed by the human race gradually and increasingly because they are such as to respond readily to the inner urge of human consciousness. They manifest themselves frequently in the form of cultural movements of various types in various parts of the world, based on ideas taken consciously or unconsciously from the ideology of the Prophet. On account of these influences the wrong ideals appear and disappear sooner than otherwise and the newly-emerging wrong ideals are nearer to the Right Ideal than they would be in their absence. They thus quicken the process of evolution going on in the direction of the Right Ideal among people outside the community of the Prophet.

But while the ideology of the Prophet sends out its influences to the wrong ideals and thereby weakens them more

and more, the wrong ideals too send out their own influences, in the form of ideas, to the ideology of the Prophet, influences of an opposite character which tend to weaken the ideology. These influences act as an impediment on the urge of consciousness in the community and on account of them the level of self-consciousness in the community tends to go down considerably very often. But whenever there arises an occasion of this kind, the urge of consciousness in the Universe comes to the help of the community. It makes an extraordinary effort or a sudden push or drive which results in the appearance of a highly self-conscious individual or a number of highly self-conscious individuals in the community who quicken the progress of the community and restore its level of self-consciousness. Evidently, this push or drive of consciousness must achieve its success and, therefore, manifest itself in men who are already in a position to favour it by reason of their growing self-consciousness, on account of their absolute obedience to the Prophet. These men are, therefore, the followers of the Last Prophet and they remain true to themselves, to their real nature and to the Consciousness of the Universe only to the extent to which they follow him and no more.

As a generally strong, healthy and growing organism has occasional periods of disease, so the community of the Prophet must now and then have a period when its self-consciousness suffers a set-back. It is the period when the social organism of the community suffers from 'moral' disease in a larger sense of the word. As physical disease is caused by germs which enter the body and sap its vitality, so moral disease is caused by ideas which enter the mind and sap the love of the Perfect Ideal. As the organism, or rather the vital force that creates, maintains and grows the organism, reacts towards disease automatically and creates anti-bodies or anti-toxins which cope with the danger and destroy or make ineffective and harmless the germs of the disease, so the social organism of the community, or rather the vital force that creates and evolves the social organism of

the community, that is to say, the Consciousness of the Universe reacts automatically towards the moral lapse of the community and creates new right ideas to cope with the danger and destroy or make ineffective and harmless the wrong ideas that had caused the moral disease of the community. In other words, whenever the self-consciousness of the community shows signs of dwindling, an automatic, sudden drive of consciousness must take place *within* the community and result in the appearance of a highly self-conscious man or a number of highly self-conscious men who have an inner experience which enables them to acquire an extraordinary realization and conviction of the truth of the Prophets' teachings and especially that aspect of them which is being ignored by the community for the time being. By virtue of this inner experience they go a step deeper into the meaning of the Prophet's Book and explain it in a way that dispels the gloom of ignorance that has come to prevail at the time and thus assure the protection of the community from the evil effects of the invading wrong ideas.

This process can have nothing to do with the stretching or the twisting of the text with a view to meeting new situations and satisfying new requirements. It is entirely different from it because the new ideas are already there in the Book and are simply unfolded or uncovered. It is similar to the process by which a plant brings on new leaves and branches. When a plant grows, it does not alter but simply comes out with itself. The new leaves and branches are, in a sense, new but really they are as old as the seed itself. They were already in the plant and they come out not because the plant has altered but because it has grown. Just as a strong, healthy organism can always oppose an effective cure (lying potentially in its nature) to every disease that comes from outside, so the ideology of the Prophet is able to oppose an effective remedy (lying potentially in its nature) to all wrong ideals that appear from time to time (in the world outside the Prophet's community)

and encroach upon the love of the ideology which its believers entertain for it. The cure in each case, in the case of the organism as well as in the case of the community, comes from *within*, because each is a *complete whole* and each has the potentiality to live continuously.

When an individual overcomes successfully the attack of a disease, he developes an immunity which is either complete and permanent or which at least makes the second attack of the disease, occurring within a specific period, less dangerous than the first. Medical science has made this principle the basis of measures, like injections and inoculations of certain kinds, by which it seeks the prevention of certain diseases. It is indeed striking that in the case of very many diseases we do not know, so far, of a more certain way of protecting the body from disease than creating the disease in the body. The disease that comes and goes away safely is a blessing in the long run because it leaves the body stronger and better fitted for a long and healthy life afterwards. The person who has suffered from many diseases and recovered completely from each has evolved and brought into full play all the latent forces of his body for defence against illness. He is, therefore, better qualified than others to enjoy a long life.

Similarly, the influences of wrong ideals, the wrong ideas that spread from wrong ideals, sometimes slowly like the infections of ordinary diseases and sometimes suddenly like epidemics, are sources of danger to the life of the Prophet's ideology and a hindrance to its growth and expansion. Yet, since the ideology is a complete whole, it is always able to overcome every such danger and turn it into a blessing for itself. By offering successful resistance to wrong ideas continuously, the Prophet's ideology becomes more and more immune from further attacks of moral diseases and still better fitted for a long and successful career. In other words, through the efforts of self-conscious individuals to defend the ideology from the influence of wrong ideas by evolving new right ideas capable of opposing

them and existing potentially in the nature of the ideology, the ideology evolves itself in such a way that it develops more and more into a systematic philosophy which it becomes increasingly difficult to assail or call into question. Finally, a time comes when no wrong ideology is able to compete with it as a rational explanation of the Universe or as a systematic and intelligible philosophy of life. At this stage the ideology becomes perfectly immune from all possible attacks of wrong ideas.

To evolve itself continuously, to outgrow ceaselessly every condition in which it can be attacked or adversely influenced by wrong ideas emerging from time to time, is a special feature, an exclusive characteristic of the Prophet's ideology which no other ideology shares with it. The ideologies of all the previous prophets fall short of the expectations of consciousness and are required to yield place to the ideology of the Last Prophet just because they are lacking in this quality or characteristic.

All knowledge is the knowledge of self. We wish to know what is other than the self in order to know the self in relation to it. To know what is other than the self is really to know the self. The knowing subject and the known object, although distinguishable, are not really separate from each other. The knower and the known are one and the same. This is evident from the nature of self-consciousness in which the same mind is at once the knower and the known. The subject and the object are, again, not separate compartments of the same mind but each of them is the whole mind. The aim of all cognition is to know the self. The advancement of knowledge means the development of human self-knowledge. Therefore all advancements of knowledge, all progress of science and philosophy, must lead to a greater and greater elucidation of an ideology that is based on the nature of self. The Book of the Last Prophet, as a description of the true nature of self, is the seed of all the knowledge that the human race evolves till the end of the world. Every fresh advancement of knowledge

is already present in it as the leaves, the branches and the flowers of a tree are already present in the seed. The evolution of the Prophet's ideology, *i.e.*, the evolution of its knowledge as a rational, coherent and systematic world-view is, therefore, helped by the growth of knowledge in the world. In fact all advancements of knowledge are tantamount to the evolution of the Prophet's ideology itself. The ideology grows through the efforts of self-conscious men within the community as well as through the efforts of scientists and philosophers outside the community. As scientific and philosophical knowledge accumulates, self-conscious men within the community employ it to interpret and elaborate the ideology further. All such knowledge enters their minds, not only to emerge as a new effulgence of light on the Prophet's ideology but also to be itself purified and purged of its errors. In their minds truth meets and compares itself with truth and thereby loses its admixture of untruth. In this way, while advancing human knowledge frequently throws light on the ideology, the ideology too often gives a lead to human knowledge which in its developed form it employs again for its own further elucidation and exposition.

All knowledge purged of errors and mis-conceptions, all real knowldge, that has been written so far in all the books of the world and that will be written in books from time to time in future, forms a part of the Prophet's ideology. and sooner or later all knowledge has to be written in the light of it or as throwing light upon it. The ideology, therefore, grows without a limit. It continues to grow long after the need to defend it against wrong ideals has ceased to exist. All search of knowledge has been in the past and will be in the future, no more than an attempt to disclose a bit more of the latent splendour of the ideology of the Last Prophet. It is impossible to exhaust in writing all the knowledge that the ideology contains even if the water in all the oceans of the world were to be turned into ink and used for the purpose. The ideology of the Prophet

begins to grow with the emergence of the first prophet, the first self-conscious human being. It reaches its first completeness in the life-example of the Last and the Complete Prophet and it continues to grow further *on the secure foundations of this completeness* till the end of the world. It is like a tree which is rooted deeply in the ground and has the capacity to grow to such enormous dimensions as to fill the whole world. All the other ideologies are like rank, unnecessary growth under this tree which tends to obstruct the growth of the tree by using away some of the water and manure meant for it but which the gardener must uproot sooner or later.

The self-conscious men who appear in the Prophets' community as a result of the extraordinary drives of consciousness reach a high stage of self-consciousness and have a mystic experience on account of which they feel that the Prophet's message (which is, of course, a true interpretation of the nature of every human being) is growing independently and automatically out of their own consciousness and is not only his message but also their own. They are favoured by a drive of consciousness and rise to a high stage of self-knowledge because of their intense love and absolute obedience to the Prophet, yet they do not get a new 'revelation' in the usual sense of the word because it is no longer possible or necessary. They only acquire a standard of self-consciousness which enables them to understand the revelation of the Prophet as thoroughly as it is essential in order to combat and crush the wrong ideas that happen to be attacking the consciousness of the community at the time. For these reasons they have no choice but to merge their own authority into the authority of the Prophet and to re-affirm and re-iterate his message without altering it in the least. Whenever any one of these self-conscious men, being deceived by the independent character of his own mystic experience, arrogates to himself the title of a prophet or any other similar or equivalent title which makes him a new centre of spiritual authority or the

founder of a new community, he mars rather than makes the picture of prophethood. The reason is that nature does not require to favour him, as an independent spiritual leader, claiming to offer a complete ideology to the world, with opportunities to exemplify by his practical life the expression of all the fundamental aspects of human nature. He, therefore, not only misunderstands a part of his nature which he cannot express, but also misinterprets and misrepresents that part of the teachings of the Last Prophet which he himself cannot exemplify. He, therefore, harms rather than helps the process of evolution. He not only creates another needless, nay, harmful split in the human society but also turns the wheel of human progress in the opposite direction. He brings back his followers to the days when prophethood had not yet reached its climax in the Last Prophet. His followers have to ignore a considerable portion of the urge of human consciousness and to leave out a good deal of the requirements of human nature. They have to neglect some fundamental and important part of the teachings of the Complete Prophet—that part of it which their leader is unable to support by the practical example of his life. They are therefore, as regards the stage of their evolution and the principles for which they stand, similar to the communities of the old prophets lingering on beyond the climax of prophethood to be absorbed by the community of the Last Prophet. They, in other words, live for a short time only.

But these mistaken and misguided self-conscious men are not without their use. They serve to raise the level of self-consciousness in the community of the Last Prophet (in that part of it, of course, which does not join the new claimant of prophethood) directly as well as indirectly. They raise it directly because they stress and propagate vigorously (and thereby draw a closer attention of the Prophet's followers to) certain aspects of the Right Ideal. They raise it indirectly because they create among the followers of the Last Prophet a vigorous reaction in favour

of that part of the fundamentals of his teachings (*e.g.*, his teachings as regards the true nature or attributes of the Creator or as regards the need of action in the service of the Perfect Ideal or the importance of the ideal's worship and adoration or of war or political independence or collective and social life as means for the evolution of consciousness in the individual and the society) which these pseudo-prophets ignore. The result is that the followers of the Prophet are led to understand and emphasise this portion of his teachings in a way which would have been otherwise impossible. This reaction reveals itself again in the appearance of self-conscious men in the Prophet's community who lead suitable counter-movements for the proper exposition and defence of such fundamentals of his teachings. While the community of the Prophet thus gains much on account of these men, it loses little because the men who leave the Prophet's fold to join the new claimants of prophethood are mostly those whose love for the Prophet's ideology has already waned and fallen a victim to the influence of wrong ideals.

The natural conservatism of the followers of the Prophet is not a check on, but rather a guarantee of, their own future evolution as well as the evolution of the knowledge of the Prophet's ideology. Just because they adhere to the Prophet's Book through thick and thin, they are able to evolve a higher and higher understanding of it as time goes on. The tree grows because the seed remains intact. On account of their conservatism they preserve the seed of the ideology, the meaning of the Book, from the misguiding effects of wrong ideals. How little it is realized that there is a kind of conservatism which can not only exist side by side with unlimited progress but which is also an indispensable condition of such progress!

Since the Prophet's Book is a replica of the real nature of every human being, with every adavancement of their self-knowledge the followers of the Prophet go a little deeper into its meaning. As a facsimile of human nature

it is fully intelligible only to those who have discovered its original in their own hearts, that is, to men who are highly self-conscious. We understand only as much of a prophet's teachings as we understand our own nature.

It does not mean that as time goes on the letter of the Book will be discarded more and more in favour of its spirit or meaning. The meaning lives in the letter and the letter is nothing without the meaning. Letter and meaning are inseperable from each other. Since neither of them can exist without the other, they form an indivisible unity, a single whole. We see the whole dimly first of all but, as our knowledge grows, it becomes clearer and clearer till it is completely exposed to our view, both letter and meaning having evolved in significance. A sea has a surface and a depth. The letter of the book as the surface of the ocean of its meaning must go with the meaning always, no matter how deep we discover the meaning to be. If we attempt to discard the letter of the Book and preserve its meaning, we shall be only giving it a new letter and along with it most certainly a new meaning. Although the Book is the same for every body in letter, it is different for every body in meaning which every body understands to the extent of his own self-knowledge. Evolution leads man towards a better and better understanding of his nature and must, therefore, lead him towards a better and better understanding of the Book. Thus, although new prophets, the founders of new communities, cease to appear, the Book itself (*i.e. its knowledge*) has a course of evolution and grows and expands with the growing self-knowledge of men. We have already compared the Book to a seed. A seed has the whole of the tree in itself and, therefore, the more it grows into a tree, the more it remains exactly the same. Quite in the same way all the knowledge of all times will be already present in the Book and, although the knowledge of the Book will evolve ceaslessly, the Book itself will remain the same always.

The revelation of a prophet is the result of an excep-

tional achievement of his urge for Beauty made possible by the manifestation of a special drive of consciousness in his person. It is an outcome of the feeling of Beauty in the state of its extraordinary development due to a special favour of nature. The human urge for Beauty is able to know and its knowledge is generally described as intuition. The cause of intuition is no other than the urge of consciousness for Beauty. Intuition is the love or the desire for Beauty. It is the voice of consciousness as we understand it. It is revelation of a low or a high standard depending upon the strength and the quality of the love of which it is a product. Intuition develops with the growth of love or with the development of self-consciousness. It has a voice which speaks and becomes clearer and clearer as we progress in self-consciousness till in some gifted persons known as prophets the stage of what is commonly understood as revelation is reached. We follow this voice when we appreciate beauty or produce works of art of all kinds or make discoveries of science and philosophy. When this voice pronounces moral judgments, it is known as the voice of *conscience*. When we act morally, we understand this voice correctly and obey it, we obey, that is, our own revelation. All our decisions and conclusions for all our beliefs and actions are dictated by the voice of intuition or the voice of revelation. Revelation is the voice of love; it is the voice of consciousness as we understand it and love it; it is the voice of our ideal whether the ideal is right or wrong. Therefore, like our love, our revelation can be either right or wrong. To the extent to which our love or our ideal is right our revelation is right and to the extent to which our love is wrong our revelation too is wrong. Revelation, understood in this sense, can never come to an end. Revelation is the speech of consciousness and speech, as a quality of consciousness, is permanent like all its other qualities.

Different persons have different capacities for love. When a person is capable of loving strongly and succeeds in developing his love, there are moments when his conscious-

ness becomes deeply absorbed in love and when, therefore, love takes full control of his consciousness. In this state of a deep and concentrated love, which has a tendency to recur like our moods, the voice of his consciousness, of his love, which is usually inaudible, becomes strong enough to induce the activity of brain-centres that hear and thus becomes audible and automatic as if it is a message whispered into his mind by an agency outside himself. This voice is above time and has the capacity to predict, vaguely or clearly (like some of our dreams) future events, as the person himself would take them to be at the time of their occurrence. It is the voice of Consciousness, but whether or not it will be pure and free from error (not as a basis of prophesies but as a guide to the Right Ideal) will depend upon the fact whether the person's love is pure and free from error or not. To the extent to which it is impure, the voice will be impure and coloured with error. As all revelation is the voice of love, whether the love is right or wrong, so revelation that is automatic and audible is the voice of a strong, concentrated love and *not necessarily* of a right or a pure love. To the extent to which a person's love is mixed with error to that extent the automatic and audible voice of his revelation is also mixed with error. The mere existence of an automatic and audible voice is therefore not a proof of its dependability or of its being free from error. A wrong love, distorts, stiffles or suppresses the voice of the Right Love and muddles its with its own voice. As there are standards of moral and aesthetic judgements, so there are standards of revelation whether it is audible or inaudible.

Revelation is no doubt the voice of the Creator, since its source is the urge of self which is the common urge of the human and the divine consciousness. The love of the Creator or the urge of self is the privilege of every human being. In fact it is the cause of all our activities. The voice of the Creator, therefore, speaks in the heart of every man every moment of his life but it is familiar to a man only to

the extent to which the Creator is familiar to him. To the extent to which a man fails to understand his Creator he fails to understand His voice and commits errors in his beliefs and actions. Revelation is guiding the life of every man every moment of his life. Sometimes it errs and sometimes it does not. Revelation in the sense of an intuitive grasp of a truth is not an exclusive gift of a prophet. A prophet shares the capacity to receive divine revelation with every other human being. But, while the revelation of ordinary men becomes mixed up with error, the revelation of a great prophet is perfectly free from error, since his love too is perfectly free from error and his love becomes free from error because his self-consciousness is raised to the highest level by a sudden, strong drive of consciousness. Men love and think of their Creator differently. So the voice of the Creator too speaks differently to them.

The pronouncements of revelation or the judgments of intuition become more and more valid as our love becomes purer and stronger or as our self-consciousness grows. The higher the standard of self-consciousness that a man has acquired, the more powerful his intuition and the more valid his moral and aesthetic judgments. At the highest stage of self-consciousness revelation becomes perfectly free from error because at that stage it is not the intuition of man but the intuition of the Creator that speaks in man. *At this stage revelation is above human criticism and valuation.*

There can be no distinction between revealed and unrevealed religions as all religions are revealed. In fact all knowledge is revelation. But a distinction must be made between a revelation that is and a revelation that is not free from error. There are some religions which are based on a comparatively low standard of revelation—a revelation that is mixed up with human philosophy or human judgments. Such religions are indeed open to human criticism and valuation.

The human self is not a hinderance to the passage of divine light. Rather, it is the only passage through which

divine light can come. It is made and adapted by nature for that purpose. But the condition is that it should be free from obstacles and obstacles are created by wrong loves of which a man may not be conscious sometimes but which, all the same, continue to flourish at the expense of the Right Love.

Revelation, as the voice of Consciousness, is never so pure and free from error as it is when it is the result of a sudden drive of consciousness. Then it is able to steer itself clear of all hinderances and distorting effects of wrong loves. The drive of consciousness pushes it above the level of wrong loves and so it escapes being coloured or distorted by them. Revelation will, of course, be the result of a sudden drive of consciousness only when conditions for such a drive are present, that is, when no revelation capable of serving the purpose and satisfying the aspirations of consciousness exists already in the world.

As the Right Love grows, it clears the consciousness more and more of wrong loves and takes a greater and greater control of it till finally it dominates it and fills it completely. The human consciousness becomes absorbed in the Divine Consciousness. The man loses touch with space and time and passes into a state which may be apparently a state of complete self-obliviousness but which is, in fact, a state of complete self-consciousness. This state passes away after a short time but once achieved, it has a tendency to recur as a mood recurs whenever circumstances favourable to the mood come to exist. If conditions favouring a sudden drive of consciousness are present it will not only aid the development of self-consciousness in some one man (who is prepared and fitted for it and, therefore, deserves to receive it best of all his contemporaries) so that he is able to attain the stage of self-consciousness described above quickly and with less than normal effort but it will also have another extraordinary result. In the effort to compensate for the lack of its progress in the human society, consciousness will take full control of the speech

faculties of the man in the state of his complete self-consciousness (apparently a state of complete self-obliviousness) and make use of his conscious and unconscious memories of the immediate and distant past in order to speak out its own purposes and desires of the past, present, and future. Its object is to guide human activities, through this man, in the direction of evolution. Consciousness in its drive, thus, forces a passage for itself, for its quality of speech, through the speech faculties of the man and manifests itself as a voice over which the man has no control. It is a characteristic of this voice (since it is the voice of intuition or love and not of reason) that it mentions facts as wholes and does not subject them to a detailed, logical analysis. This state of the human self, favourable for the reception of pure revelation has, when once achieved, a tendency to recur as often as it is possible and necessary. The voice of Divine Consciousness, *latent in the nature of every man*, becomes audible and automatic in this man in such a way that it leaves him no doubt that it is the pure voice of Consciousness, speaking for the guidance of mankind. This conviction is engendered, sustained and strengthened by the voice itself and becomes so strong that the man cannot afford to disobey the voice or to suppress it or mix it with the desires of his lower nature. But if any self-conscious man comes to have such a conviction after the appearance of the Last Prophet on the ground that he hears an automatic voice, his conviction will be unfounded for reasons already explained. The drive of consciousness *will not require* to manifest itself in a new automatic and audible revelation of the pure type in any person after the Last Prophet.

A part of the revelation of a man who has been raised to the status of a prophet by a drive of consciousness may be entirely pure and free from error, being in the form of an automatic voice that is beyond his control. Even the rest of his revelation is of a very high standard, being the outcome of an exceptionally high degree of self-conscious-

ness, which is difficult to achieve under ordinary circumstances and which the prophet is able to achieve only as a result of a sudden powerful drive of consciousness. But, in any case, the latter kind of revelation must be of a lower kind than the former. It cannot be free from error and there must be occasions when his revelation of the former type will criticise and reject his revelation of the latter quality. If such occasions of self-reproach and self-criticism arise, they will, of course, be an indication that the automatic and audible revelation of the man has a level of its own and is perfectly pure and free from his revelation of the lower type and, therefore, free from all admixture of his own human philosophy and wisdom.

When consciousness makes a drive, it chooses the man who deserves it best of all his contemporaries. The choice is not the cause of the drive. It is made in the course of the drive and is rather the result of the drive, which can reach its maximum only in a man who is best fitted for it. The drive does not take place in the man because he is most suitable for it but the man proves himself to be most suitable for it because the drive is able to achieve its maximum success only in *his* person. Thus the drive may begin in a number of persons at the same time and wait to see who gives it the fullest scope or the greatest facilities. For this reason a drive of consciousness, whether it is intended to create the founder of a new community or to raise the level of self-consciousness in the community of the Last Prophet, directly or indirectly by emphasising a part or the whole of the Right Ideology, may be attended by a sort of a general awakening in a part of the human race or a part of the Prophet's community. Sometimes it may be accompanied by a more or less simultaneous appearance of a number of men who may imagine themselves to be the recipients of a light which is meant to pass on to other human beings. It is possible, therefore, that some of these men, unable to understand their correct position, may claim to be the founders of new communities, in opposi-

tion to the justified claims of a man in whom the drive has achieved its biggest success and who is, therefore, meant to be their leader, or at a time when the community of the Last Prophet has already come into existence and when, therefore, the drive aims at no more than raising and restoring the level of self-consciousness in this community directly or indirectly. But in case the drive manifests itself in a number of men in the community of the Last Prophet, every one of them may be useful in his own way. The reason is that every one of them will be a follower of the Prophet and not the founder of a new community and his message will be subject to evaluation and criticism in the light of the practical life of the Prophet.

The success of the drive is not entirely a one sided-affair. When the drive of consciousness begins in a man, it waits for him to give it facilities to push forward. If it is able to get the facilities that it requires, it is enabled to extend its foothold in the man and thereby to aid him to give it further facilities. In this way not only does it make use of the facilities that the man is able to offer but also creates more facilities for itself through him. This mutual co-operation of the human consciousness and the consciousness of the Universe reaches its maximum in one man in whom, therefore, the drive achieves its greatest success. The man who is entrusted with the mission of a prophet leads a good life and resorts to prayers and devotions frequently even before he receives the mission. This preparation for the mission on the part of a would-be prophet is at once the cause and the result of the drive of consciousness manifesting itself in his person.

The man in whom the drive of consciousness achieves its highest results must be a perfect specimen of humanity from a physiological point of view, more particularly as regards the structure of his brain which is the passage and the immediate instrument of consciousness. If he is not such a type of humanity, the limitations of his physical constitution will stand in the way of the drive achieving

the full measure of its success in his person and the drive will have to favour another man with a more suitable structure of the brain.

The nature of every human being is fundamentally the same. All human beings possess the same instincts and the same urge of consciousness. Yet the mental dispositions of all of them are not identical. Human beings have various temperaments and capacities. They are peevish or jovial, obstinate or accommodating, proud or humble, patient or restless, talkative or thoughtful, stern or mild, prudent or reckless, malicious or forbearing, cruel or kind, brave or timid and so on. Education and discipline can alter such characteristics of men to a considerable extent but never completely in every case. Some persons have to put in a greater effort than others in order to behave well. The same environment, training, education and discipline do not produce the same results and do not create the same temperament in every individual. The differences of human temperaments or moral constitutions are created by differences in the structures of human brains. On account of these differences consciousness has greater or lesser facilities of expression with regard to certain of its qualities in the case of different individuals. As all apples in a tree are not perfectly round and symmetrical, so all human brains are not of a perfectly harmonious and symmetrical development. Different centres of the brain are differently developed in different persons. Majority of human beings have more or less abnormal brains and therefore somewhat abnormal mental and moral dispositions. A perfectly harmonious and balanced structure of the brain must result in a perfectly normal and balanced temperament—a temperament in which all the qualities of consciousness are able to have their correct and harmonious expression. Such a temperament will, therefore, give the greatest facilities and the fullest scope for a drive of consciousness. In such a temperament alone can the qualities of consciousness achieve their most harmonious and, *there-*

fore, their fullest expression. Since the brain is the passage of consciousness, its harmonious structure must be a condition for a big stride of consciousness.

When an individual wants to submit himself to the discipline of the Right Ideal, his idiosyncrasies or the peculiarities of his mental and moral dispositions, interfere with this discipline and, therefore, with the evolution of this consciousness to the highest levels. This is one reason why it is not easy for every man to approach the level of evolution which can be achieved by a great prophet, who is of course, physiologically a perfect specimen of humanity. It is difficult to tell how much of a person's character is due to the physiology of his brain and how much to his mental outlook or to the nature of his ideal. But in a healthy person the psychological factor is ultimately stronger than the physiological one and is capable of over-ruling it. The rigorous discipline of the Right Ideal, which of course becomes easier to obey with the growth of self-consciousness, compensates for the lack of physiological symmetry of the brain. It tends to create a harmonious character even when the structure of the brain is lacking in harmony and thereby tends to reduce or limit the activity of the brain centres that are developed too much and to stimulate and increase the activity of the centres that are developed too little. If this discipline continues uninterrupted for a long time from generation to generation, it must mould the structure of the human brain and make it more and more harmonious and symmetrical. Thus we conclude that the common individual will have a far more symmetrical and harmoniously developed brain in future than he has to-day, and it will, therefore, be possible for him to reach a far higher level of self-consciousness in future than it is possible for him to-day. The forces of evolution tend to minimise the mental abnormalities of individuals and to develop them more and more into perfect biological specimens.

Although a prophet has periods when his self is deeply

absorbed in Consciousness, he never loses touch with himself and one reason why he is able to do so is that the structure of his brain is adapted for a big drive of consciousness. If a wooden disc of a regular shape and a uniform density is made to float on water, it will remain perfectly balanced, one of its flat surfaces being completely above the level of water. But if its density is greater on one side than on the other, it will be unable to maintain its equilibrium and the heavier side will sink below the surface of water. Some such thing (I confess the example is rather a crude one) happens in the case of a prophet. As he has a perfectly proportionate and symmetrical brain and a perfectly balanced mental constitution, therefore, when his self dives into Consciousness, he does not lose his mental equilibrium. He remains perfectly sane and perfectly healthy mentally, during and after the periods when he gets deeply absorbed in Consciousness. He is, therefore, able to distinguish between himself and the Divine Consciousness even at the moment of his highest self-realization. But even an ordinary individual may be able to retain his mental health at a very high stage of self-consciousness provided he is a true follower of the prophet of the age and offers a strict obedience to him. The reason is that such a person traverses his path leading into the highest and the most unknown regions of self-consciousness not alone but in the company of a leader who is most thoroughly familiar with that path. But in the absence of this condition of absolute obedience to his prophet the individual will either never reach a high stage of self-consciousness or, if he does so, he will lose his mental balance and as a consequence fail to distinguish between his own self and the self of the Creator. His utterances during periods of absorption are insane and his insanity takes many forms. But, for the reason just explained, a faithful follower of a prophet is always in a position to understand and guard himself against such errors in case they should arise and thereby to protect his individuality for a continuous progress of self-consciousness.

A prophet is strongly impelled to lead other people and to create a community of his followers and his followers too are impelled strongly to lead other people and thereby to enlarge their own numbers by adding new members to the community. The prophet's urge to lead is not peculiar to the prophet. This urge is a part of the urge of consciousness which is common to all human beings but which, like every other aspect of this urge, attains to its maximum force and its clearest manifestition in the case of a prophet. The aim of this impulsion is to aid and complete the growth of life as a whole. The urge of consciousness is not only to live in a group but also to create a group by leading and commanding as well as by following and obeying other men. As a source of water at a higher level has the impulsion to flow down to lower levels, so life at higher levels transmits itself to lower levels in order to aid and complete its own highest development as a whole. An individual is an inseparable part of a group as a living cell is an inseparable part of an organism. The man who is all alone with his views and opinions feels like a piece broken from a whole. He feels restless and has no satisfaction unless he gathers together by his side a number of human beings with similar views and opinions, that is, men who believe in his own ideal. He must find followers or follow others in order to satisfy the urge of his consciousness to create and live in a group. People who give their knowledge to others satisfy their own urge of consciousness and do a duty to themselves.

Whenever a man feels that he knows better than others, he is impelled to impart his knowledge to others or to lead others, and whenever he feels that he knows less than others, he is impelled to acquire knowledge from others or to fellow others. In other words, when a man feels that he is nearer to Consciousness than his fellow men, he is urged to assist them to approach Consciousness and, whenever he feels that he is farther away from Consciousness than some of his fellowmen, he is urged to approach

Consciousness through them. Since every person knows better than some men and less than some other men, every person is a leader as well as a follower and by satisfying our urge to lead and the urge to obey we are all helping the process of evolution and bringing each other nearer and nearer the source of consciousness every moment. The urge to lead and obey in the human consciousness is a manifestation of the urge of consciousness in the Universe to pass on the wave of life gradually from a point where it is the highest to the whole of humanity with a view to evolving it continuously. It is nature's provision for aiding and bringing to a completeness the process of evolution through the agency of human beings. On account of this urge the ideal spreads from one man to a constantly increasing group of men and life goes on feeding one part of it after the other in order that the whole of it may reach its fullest growth. This urge enables life to grow and procreate on the psychological level of evolution as the sex urge enables life to grow and procreate on the biological level. On the biological level of life it expresses itself in the process by which one cell grows another in a living organism or by which one organism procreates another. But on the psychological plane it manifests itself in the process by which the ideal of one man becomes the ideal of another.

Every part of life has the urge not only to evolve itself but also to share its evolution with other parts in order that the whole of it and not merely a part of it, may reach its highest evolution. The reason is that life is one; it is a single whole and must evolve itself as a whole or not at all. A man who does not give his knowledge to other men fails to satisfy an urge of his consciousness and harms his own continued evolution. He can reach his highest evolution only in the whole of which he is a part and, if he does not aid the evolution of this whole, he does not aid his own evolution and denies the urge of his consciousness its complete and coutinuous satisfaction.

The urge to lead and follow is a characteristic of all consciousness. It characterizes the human as well as the Divine Consciousness. The real and the ultimate leader of all life is the Consciousness of the Universe and every other leader at every level of life is a representative of Consciousness as it appears to the leader and his followers and as it manifests itself at that level of life. A prophet too, like every other leader, is a representative of Consciousness and creates a group on behalf of Consciousness. But unlike other leaders he is a true representative of Consciousness and in him the voice of Consciousness is pure and free from error.

Every self, whether human or divine, is at once a leader and a follower, The Divine Self leads as well as follows Itself. Ultimately every self leads itself and follows itself because, whenever it is leading or following another self, it is only reaching itself, advancing towards itself. Every self obeys its ideal which is a part of itself. Therefore every self is at once obeying itself and leading itself for the sake of its own self-realization. This is true also of the Divine Consciousness. The Divine Self too has an ideal and is, therefore, following and leading Itself for the sake of Its own self-realization.

No ideal, whether wrong or right, can have more than one group or one leader. A group may be scattered geographically and may have several parts but it is one as long as it has one leader. When an ideal has two leaders and two groups, it is not one ideal but two ideals. Men's ideals may remain the same in theory but they will be different in fact, if their actions differ, and their actions will differ, if their groups differ. Ultimately the ideal takes the form of the practical life of the individual. But the practical life of the individual is his practical social life which he leads in company with other men of the same ideal and under the guidance of their common leader. The urge of love for the ideal includes the urge of love for men of the same ideal. It can, therefore, find an adequate

satisfaction only in a group.

No individual is meant to be alone. Every man is a part of a group. His ideal makes him responsible towards itself as well as towards the group in its capacity as a community of human beings striving collectively for the same ideal. His responsibility towards the ideal includes his responsibility towards such a community. Every individual in the group can satisfy both these responsibilities, which are really inclusive of each other and which require his simultaneous attention, only if he offers absolute obedience to one man, a leader who on account of his superior devotion to the ideal must be taken to be the representative of the group as well as of the ideal. The leader's responsibility towards the ideal too will include his responsibility towards the group and, therefore, absolute obedience to his orders (which will be, of course, the outcome of a love superior to that of any other individual in the group) will enable his follower to satisfy his own responsibility of the same kind in the best of the ways possible. Action in obedience to such a leader alone will be conducive to the complete satisfaction of the self as it alone will satisfy the individual's desire for group life led in accordance with the needs of the ideal. We see, therefore, that *moral action of the highest standard resolves itself ultimately into action in obedience to the implied or explicit orders of the leader of the group of the Right Ideal.*

A superior love is an intense love but it is not to be indentified with a mad and reckless passion. The best love should always be able to take care of itself and to guide itself correctly and successfully to its end. A superior love should manifest itself in a harmonious expression of all the qualities of consciousness which are known collectively as the qualities of the head and heart. The leader should be a man who has proved himself to be capable of giving the right expression to these qualities at the right time, better than anybody else in the group.

The leader of the group of the Right Ideal cannot be

a despot. As a highly self-conscious individual, he is bound to be extremely sensitive of his responsibilities towards the ideal and towards the group and these responsibilities must compel him to consult the best among his followers for his own guidance, although their advice cannot bind him. Such a leader can never act except in good faith and can, therefore, never create a situation in which the interests of the ideal require his followers to shake off his authority. The reason is that, even when he appears to his followers to be wrong, they will not disobey him, on account of their faith in his good intentions and his loyalty to the ideal. Unless there is a perfectly clear evidence to show that such loyalty has been abandoned in favour of another ideal, absolute obedience to the leader will be essential for the individual in the interest of his ideal and will be in accordance with the urge of his nature. There are bound to be occasions when the judgement of the leader will appear to him to be wrong because it will differ from his own. If on such occasions, the individual obeys the leader rather than himself, it will not amount to a suppression of his own freedom but it will be a free and willing subordination of his own judgement to the judgement of the leader in the best interests of his ideal. Our action is free action whenever we judge it freely to be in the best interests of our ideal. The individual's faith in the leader will be strengthened and will become ultimately unshakable, when events will show his judgement to be more valid than his own. But even when events have shown conclusively hat his judgement was wrong, the individual will have served the ideal better by obeying the leader than by disobeying him.

It is a far greater service to the ideal to maintain the unity of the ideal-group on an error than to shatter it for the sake of a correction. When the unity and, therefore, the power of the ideal is shattered, no correction of errors is possible. Errors made by a perfectly harmonious and disciplined group of men rectify themselves far more easily than

to justify any breach of discipline on the part of men who want to put it on the right track. A group is meant to function as a single individual. Like an individual it must be sometimes wrong and sometimes right and like an individual it must learn by experience. An individual who is too impatient of the errors of his leader wants (whether he knows it not) to rebel against his ideal itself. He wants to hamper the free expression of the urge of his own nature. It may look strange and yet it is a fact that an individual can give a perfectly free expression to his individuality only by losing it in the individuality of the group. He has to be right or wrong with the group because he is an inseparable part of the group. To obey and not to disobey the leader is the urge of our nature.

Except at the very last stages of the evolution of humanity, of which it is difficult to give a detailed forecast at present, it will be impossible for men to serve their ideal without acknowledging the authority of a living human leader. We cannot do without a leader because we cannot do without group-life. The future man will have, from time to time, his leaders who will be the representatives of the Last Prophet in his capacity as the first representative of Consciousness to lay before men their Final Ideal complete in all its fundamentals.

The perfect Prophet must come at the end of a long chain of prophets for reasons already explained. He cannot, therefore, appear during the earliest stages of human history. Again his ideology is to envolve itself from simple principles and programme of life into a completely rational and systematic philosophy of the Universe capable of ousting all other philosophies only by reacting continuously towards all sorts of wrong ideas emanating from all possible wrong ideals. As such he cannot appear during the last stages of human evolution. We have to come to the conclusion, therefore, that he must come some time in the middle of the history of human civilization.

The career of the ideology of the Last Prophet divides

itself automatically into four natural periods.

During the *First Period* the community of its believers spreads from one man to a considerable section of humanity. Their general level of self-consciousness is very high and their actions *exemplify* the process of actual, conscious evolution of humanity. During this period the ideology eclipses almost all the contemporary wrong ideals and succeeds in getting a greater and greater number of converts from them. But as time goes on, new wrong ideals continue to appear. The *Second Period* in the career of the ideology begins when the wrong ideals have gained in power and superficial attractiveness sufficiently to be able to exert a harmful influence on the ideology of the Prophet, to overshadow its beauty and to encroach imperceptibly in a thousand and one way upon that love which its believers entertain for it. This is a period of a hard struggle between life as expressed in the Prophet's community and its obstacles arising from the adverse effects of the surrounding wrong ideals. But in spite of overwhelming dangers the ideology is able to resist a total disintegration. It perists and holds its own in a considerable part of the community because it represents a high standard of life which consciousness seeks to maintain at all costs. The struggle that the ideology undergoes during this period is extremely beneficial to it, since on account of it the ideology befits itself all the more for its future life and expansion. In due course of time, on account of this struggle, it is able to evolve itself gradually into a systematic philosophy and thus succeeds in attracting greater and greater attention from people outside the community.

While the Prophet's ideology struggles for its life in this way, the wrong ideals continue to emerge, expand, reach the apex of their glory and then decline and ultimately dissolve and disappear, giving place to new wrong ideals which in their turn have a similar fate. This process of the evolution of wrong ideals is hastened by their mutual wars and struggles in all their phases and varieties. The end

of this process begins when the adherents of one of the wrong ideals become disappointed with their ideal in such a way that it is impossible for them to be duped by another wrong ideal again and nothing but the Right Ideal appears to them to be capable of giving the fullest satisfaction to their nature. The ideal, therefore, dissolves and yields place to the Right Ideal. This comes about also because, in the meantime, the understanding of the Prophet's ideology has grown inside and outside the Prophet's community in such a way that it is acknowledged as the most accurate and the most perfect philosophy of man and Universe. As a philosophy of life it comes into comparison with other ideologies and succeeds in winning over, first of all, the best and the most sensitive of minds, and later on the common man, to the conviction that it is the most satisfactory explanation of existence. As a philosophy it begins to acquire adherents in every country in the world and slowly their numbers increase.

Two factors contribute to the gradual development of the Prophet's Ideology into a philosophy during this period. Firstly, the growth of scientific and philosophical knowledge throughout the world and, secondly, the efforts of self-conscious thinkers within the Prophet's community to interpret the Ideology in the light of this knowledge so as to make it more and more comprehensible to the world. As a result of these efforts the Ideology absorbs more and more of scientific knowledge and thus develops more and more into a science. In short, the Ideology is pressing itself already on the attention of scholars as the only rational and scientific explanation of the Universe when the believers of some wrong ideals have reason to become thoroughly dissatisfied with their ideals. As a consequence, they are attracted by the Ideology, adopt it and become completely satisfied with it. In this way the Ideology gets a large influx of devoted converts from one of the most advanced sections of humanity. These men set the stage for a second rise of the Prophet's Ideology not

merely as one of the religions this time but also as the only complete and convincing rational or scientific explanation of man and Universe. Thus the emergence of the Final Ideology, *as a result* of the mutual struggle and consequent disruption of wrong ideals one after the other, is only the re-emergence of the religious ideology of the Last Prophet in the form of a complete and systematic philosophy of life.

Here the Prophet's Ideology enters the *Third Period* of its career. During this period the Ideology grows once again (mainly through the efforts of its new devotees) into an important political power in the world. It fights and conquers wrong ideals for its self-defence and thus incidentally delivers people from their obstinacy and unreasonable persistence in the love of wrong ideals. By shattering the organizations of wrong ideals one after the other it enables their believers to see the superiority of its own philosophy as the most convincing and the most satisfactory explanation of existence. In short, it takes an active part in the war of ideals and brings it to an end by conquering all wrong ideals throughout the world. During this period too, the old community of the Prophet gets a new life since it is relieved of its struggle against the adverse effects of wrong ideals which have been long undermining its love insidiously. The spell of wrong ideals having broken, their un-recognized, mysterious attraction having disappeared, the community regains bit by bit their love for the Right Ideal which they had lost. As their self-consciousness grows, they gain in strength and courage and become ardent supporters and helpers of the new community of converts struggling for the supremacy of the Right Ideal in the world.

The *Fourth Period* in the career of the Prophet's Ideology begins when it has conquered all wrong ideals and united the whole of the human race by establishing its own rule all over the earth. Since, during this period, the human race is free to worship and adore their own ideal,

the Perfect Ideal, as well as to act and struggle for its realization, their love for the ideal grows to the fullest extent and as their love for the ideal grows their unity also grows till they are able to function as a single individual.

The love of man for man, we know, is a part of the urge of self, a part of the love of the Creator. We are disunited because we misunderstand our nature. Since we lack self-consciousness, we give different interpretations to our desire for the Perfect Ideal which is one. What is really one desire is divided by us, in our ignorance, into several desires and the result is our discord and disunity. To the extent to which we understand our nature, we are united and, to the extent to which we fail to understand, it we are disunited. To the extent to which accurate understanding of human nature is the common property of all mankind, there is, even now, a unity among the human race side by side with their acute differences. At present we are struggling to know more and more of ourselves. As time will go on, we shall understand our nature more and more and hence our unity will grow more and more and our disunity will become less and less. When the Right Ideology will establish itself as the only political power in the world, it will not only unite the human race under one government but will also create conditions in which their love for the Right Ideal and, therefore, their self-knowledge and their real unity will increase to the highest limits. It is difficult to imagine the immense powers, mental, material, and moral which the human race (united as a single individual) will command at this time.

As the human race will evolve their self-consciousness through their *absolute reliance* on the Prophet, they will enrich themselves more and more with his spiritual knowledge, with the result that they will begin to feel more and more independent of him. But in spite of it, there will be, owing to a constant growth of their own self-consciousness, their own inner light, an ever greater and greater conformity to the external form as well as to the innermost

meaning and spirit of the Prophet's teachings in every action of the individual and the society till they become what the Prophet, nay, the Creator, would have *finally* made them Himself. At this stage man will be giving a perfectly free and full expression to the urge of his nature.

With the emergence of man, the driving force of evolution ceased to operate in the biological world and instead applied itself whole-heartedly to the task of ideological or psycho-social evolution in the world of human beings. Hence as soon as man came into existence biological mutations came to an end, but since the process of biological evolution cannot be repeated now we have no means of observing how they actually occurred in the past. Experiments such as those carried out by De Vries, Tower, Morgan and Johannsen, cannot but produce artificial mutations which are due to the plasticity allowed by nature to the individuals of each species to vary within certain limits which cannot be overstepped. As some species have more of this plasticity than others the characters of their offspring produced under certain artificial conditions, *e.g.*, crossbreeding or selecting of mates etc., can be made to look like a natural mutation. Artificial mutations are mostly of a negative character, registering the loss of some quality found in the parent individuals. Even if their results are positive their occurrence is so rare and their scope is so limited that they can give us no idea of the degree of wealth and abundance in which mutations must have occurred during the biological ages. In any case they are very important, since they indicate that biological mutations are possible and must have occurred in the past. But for those who doubt their occurence a convincing proof will be found in the nature of consciousness itself as it stands revealed in the history of the human society or the course of ideological evolution which is known to us far more definitely than the course of biological evolution. We know that the emergence of every new ideological community in the past was due to a psychological muta-

tion giving rise to a man, of an exceptional psychological efficiency and superiority, whose followers or ideological descendants formed the new community. Since consciousness is one and its essential tendencies remain the same at each stage of evolution, we have reason to believe that the emergence of every new species in the past must be due to a biological mutation giving rise to an individual, of an exceptional biological efficiency and superiority, whose descendants constituted the new species.

The tendency of consciousness to compensate for a continued slackness of its movement by a sudden big effort, which is the cause of mutations and prophets at the animal and the human stages of evolution respectively is a very general one and mutations and prophethood are not the only results of its operation. Obstacles always stimulate the activity of consciousness, wherever it may be and whatever may be the stage of its evolution and the sphere of its action. The sudden automatic appearance of a prophet in a deteriorating society is like the sudden automatic appearance of a storm in an area where the pressure of atmosphere has lowered or like the sudden automatic reaction of an organism towards disease which results in the restoration of its health. Psychology is only a higher kind of Biology and we see the evidence of this tendency of consciousness on the psychological plane of life in the activity of our own consciousness. Whenever we constantly fail to act upto our sincere convictions, we experience a mental reaction and make an extra-ordinary effort to prove worthy of ourselves. It is on account of this that we find some men and women becoming social and political workers, recluses, fakirs or monks after having lived for sometime a life which they considered below themselves. And it is on account of this that sometimes, when we feel we have been too lazy, we start working with a sudden burst of enthusiasm and then go on working for hours at a stretch. Our creative activity of the highest order expresses itself by fits and starts. A poet has the capacity to create

and write but he does not write always. He waits for inspiration which comes to him suddenly when his creativeness is at its lowest ebb. Then it operates almost irresistibly and in spite of him. Life remains long almost at a standstill and then suddenly gathers itself for an effort in the creation of something new, something hitherto unknown and we have a "mutation".

Every organism in nature looks to its own maintenance and growth and contains within itself the principle by which it overcomes its own defects and compensates for its own lapses. Such is the case with societies, communities or social organisms too. Prophethood is the reaction of the human social organism towards diseases of wrong ideas and is as natural and essential for its continued evolution as the reaction of an individual organism towards disease is essential for its health and growth.

IDEOLOGY OF THE FUTURE

"Hitherto the development of civilization has been lopsided. Mankind has made an astounding progress in the domain of material sciences, Physics, Chemistry and Technology, while it has made no progress whatsoever towards understanding the true nature of man. The result is a chaos in the social sciences and a complete disorder in human affairs which threatens the extinction of civilization and even the total annihilation of mankind. Thinking men all the world over are painfully convinced that unless man develops an understanding of his own nature in near proportion to his understanding of matter the human race may not survive at all.

Here is a book that fulfils the crying need of mankind at this hour. It is a book on the Science of Man... The author's thesis that the urge for ideals is the real, the ultimate and the sole dynamic power of human action seems to be a long overdue discovery of the most important of all the laws of human nature. It has to be accepted as a scientific truth since it accounts for, explains and imparts a coherence to all the known facts of existence, accumulated so far by the scientists, philosophers, and mystics of the world. The author has given what is no doubt the final refutation of the paychological theories of Karl Marx, Freud, Adler and McDougall and his theory of the process of history is far clearer and far more convincing than the theories of Marx, Spengler and Toynbee.

A remarkable feature of the book is its integration and correlation of all the facts of Knowledge belonging to diverse fields of inquiry. The accomplishment of the important task, though rarely possible in this age of specialization, was indeed essential for a book on the Science of Man... One is extremely refreshed to note as one reads the book that the writer is able to quote a striking biological analogy in additional support of each of his significant conclusions in the field of Psychology.

There is no doubt that the emergence of this book marks the beginning of a new intellectual revolution as it constitutes one of the most important additions to contemporary thought in a sphere where it was needed most".

"Dawn," Karachi.
Dec. 2, 1956.